January 1967

THE ARYAN PATH

VOLUME XXXVIII - NO. 1

EDITORIAL REPRINT

The Gift of Detachment

GEORGE BOSWORTH BURCH

Natural Law and the Supreme Court

S. C. VARMA

The Way of Humanism

ROBERT WALLER

An Approach to Creative Ecology: I

BOOKS REVIEWED INCLUDE

Buddhism: The Religion of Analysis; the late Hugh I'Anson Fausset's *The Lost Dimension*; *The Petition to Rām*; *Mirat-i-Ahmadi: A Persian History of Gujarat*; *Your Child Is a Person*; *Deities and Dolphins*

complete CONTENTS within

Point out the 'Way'
however dimly and lost among the host —
as does the Evening Star
to those who tread their path in darkness.

Editor:
SOPHIA WADIA

Contribute Generously to Prime Minister's Drought Relief Fund Contribute Generously

This is

No Ordinary Appeal....

"A second year of the most cruel drought has placed the well-being and even the lives of millions of our countrymen in extreme jeopardy ... .

"I appeal to every individual to come forward in a big way to assist our distressed countrymen in the drought and scarcity areas.

"Cheques and contributions in cash or kind may be sent to the P.M.'s Drought Relief Fund, Cabinet Secretariat, Rashtrapati Bhavan, New Delhi 4."

Indira Gandhi
PRIME MINISTER

CONTRIBUTE GENEROUSLY TO PRIME MINISTER'S DROUGHT RELIEF FUND

Contribute Generously to Prime Minister's Drought Relief Fund Contribute Generously

THE ARYAN PATH

Editor: SOPHIA WADIA
Assistant Editor: Rameshchandra Sirkar

CONTRIBUTIONS

The Editor is responsible for unsigned contributions only and is not necessarily in agreement with the views of the contributors, to whom free expression of opinion is given

SUBSCRIPTIONS

THE ARYAN PATH is published monthly. Subscriptions are annual, but may begin with any desired month. Orders, accompanied by the appropriate remittance, should be sent to the Editorial and Business Office, Bombay, or the London Office

RATES

	Single Copy	Annual Subscription
INDIA	Re. 1.25	Rs. 12.00
EUROPE	1*s.* 9*d.*	18*s.* (or equivalent)
THE AMERICAS	50 cents	$5.00 (or equivalent)

OFFICES

EDITORIAL & BUSINESS OFFICE	Theosophy Hall, 40 New Marine Lines Bombay 1
LONDON OFFICE	62 Queen's Gardens, London W. 2

Available in the U.S.A. from Eastern News Distributors 255 Seventh Avenue, New York 1, N.Y.

THE ARYAN PATH : VOL. XXXVIII · NO. 12

January 1967

	The Gift of Detachment	1
GEORGE BOSWORTH BURCH	Natural Law and the Supreme Court	3
S. C. VARMA	The Way of Humanism	11
R. N. KAK	The Practice of Faith and Other Cardinal Virtues	16
GURDIAL MALLIK	Remembering Gandhiji	21
ROBERT WALLER	An Approach to Creative Ecology : I	23
ALUN LLEWELLYN	The Geometry of Thought	27
JOHN AINSWORTH	Are You God ?	32
	NEW BOOKS AND OLD	
B. V. NARAYANA REDDY	A Modern Interpretation of Buddhism	35
	and reviews by	
	JOAN N. BURNETT, TERENCE WHITE GERVAIS, S. R. TIKEKAR, B. G. COOPER, ELIZABETH CROSS, HOWARD SERGEANT, B. FARRINGTON, EDWARD THORNTON, AND A. A. A. FYZEE	36
BALDOON DHINGRA	Leaves from a Paris Diary	42
	ENDS AND SAYINGS	44

THE ARYAN PATH

Point out the "Way" — however dimly, and
lost among the host — as does the evening star
to those who tread their path in darkness.

— *The Voice of the Silence*

VOL. XXXVIII JANUARY 1967 No. 1

The Gift of Detachment

[WE reprint this Editorial from THE ARYAN PATH, January 1931.—ED.]

ACCORDING to our Theosophical tenets, every man and every woman is endowed more or less with a magnetic potentiality, which, when helped by a sincere, and especially by an intense and indomitable *Will,* is the most effective of magic levers placed by Nature in human hands — for woe as for weal. Let us then, as Theosophists, use that will to send sincere greetings and good wishes for the New Year to every living creature under the Sun — enemies and falsifiers included. We shall be doubly successful if we use that lever, as did the Ancients, in conjunction with the fulcrum which Nature provides. The festival now observed by the Christians on New Year's Day is not a universal one, because it but commemorates the circumcision of the Infant Jesus. Universal festivals were all fixed according to Surya, the Sun — the father of all calendars and of the Zodiac — and are but symbols of the Sun God and the twelve great, but still minor, gods, who subsequently became sacred in the cycle of national and tribal religions.

However, the western New Year's Day is not without its esoteric significance. The month of January (*Januarius*) is dedicated to Janus, the representative of the ever-revolving cycle, the double-faced God of Time who looks towards the East and the Past, as well as towards the West and the Future. His statue had twelve altars at its feet, symbolizing the twelve months of the Solar year; engraved on his right hand was the number 300, and on the left 65 — the number of days in the Solar Year; in one hand he bore a sceptre, and in the other a key, whence his name *Janitor,* the door-keeper of the Heavens, he who opens the gates of the year — *Janua* meaning "the gate that openeth the year." Further, he presided over the four seasons as the genius of the yearly cycle. Our Christian readers will see the origin of the Janitor of Paradise, Peter, who alone is said to hold the keys thereto, and who, moreover, presides over the four Evangelists.

Therefore, if we desire our New Year wish for all to be real, and not a mere lip-expression, we must address Janus in his relation to the ONE — the Sun. But Janus has thirty-one attendants in the calendar, and his first day has not as potent a power of beneficence as is generally supposed; so, as we are nicknamed the "sevening lunatics" any way, we should prefer another day for *our* New Year.

What about the 3rd? It was consecrated to Minerva-Athene, the Goddess of Wisdom, and to *Isis* — she who generates life — patroness of the good city of Lutetia, now baptized Paris, while she herself has been transformed by canonization into St. Genevieve! Thus *Isis* is offered religious honours in every Parisian and Latin Church. The 3rd January, therefore, has claims upon the reverence and recognition of Theosophists. In passing, we may note that in the Hindu Calendar, the day of Sarasvati-Puja, worship of the Goddess of Wisdom, falls in January and is celebrated as Vasanta Panchami.

Esotericists, however, swear not by the Triad, but by the Tetraktys; so let us turn to the 4th day of Janus. We find that for ages it has been sacred to Mercury, known to the Greeks as Hermes, later to become St. Hermes of the Roman Catholic pantheon! In Egypt he was called Thoth. The Aryan Parent of this God, under whatever name, is Budha, the Star by whose Light all the Buddhas guide their footsteps in the darkness of this world.

THE ARYAN PATH was born on the 4th of January 1930. It is consecrated to the worship of Budha — the God of Wisdom. It therefore endeavours to present the esoteric and spiritual viewpoints on all topics, as also to arm each self-energized soul with the sword of true ideals. *Śukra*-Venus enlightens the mind, but *Budha*-Mercury energizes the intuition; the former bestows the power of discrimination-*viveka*, but the latter makes the gift of detachment-*vairāgya*. These two virtues are the primal needs of all humanity. Discrimination is at least valued in our civilization which is rooted in the achievements of the mind, but which cannot fully blossom without the warmth of the intuition. So THE ARYAN PATH wills that all its subscribers, readers, and friends not only may learn to live by the light of discrimination, as so many are already doing in the world of thought and culture, but further may join the small band of Noble Companions who make it their prime task to learn to love all by the power of detachment, to love without distinction of race, creed, sex, caste, or colour. That is the Life of the Spirit, an ever-expanding Realization of Unity through Wisdom-Compassion — the Law of Laws, eternal Harmony, the SELF of SELF, shoreless universal essence, the light of everlasting right, the fitness of all things, the Life of Love Eternal.

GEORGE BOSWORTH BURCH

Natural Law and the Supreme Court

[We are glad to have again a contribution from our esteemed friend, Professor George Bosworth Burch of the Tufts University, U.S.A. Professor Burch sketches in a background of the evolution of the basis of law and finally discusses an interesting change which seems to be coming into the decisions of the Supreme Court of the U.S.A. Again and again in history there is the emergence of the conception of natural law, that is, a universal natural basis for political law — a basis in the very nature of Reason. However the interpretations of this may have varied, it is a testimony to the innate human idea that this is a universe of law and that all social and political institutions must shape themselves according to the pattern in nature. The article deserves the closest attention to its close-knit exposition.—ED.]

NATURAL LAW was the foundation of the legal system of the European Middle Ages. There were, to be sure, other sources — the canon law of the Church, the tribal law of the German conquerors, the whims of persons in power; and law was of course often defied by those strong enough to do so. Still, the great medieval idea prevailed in theory and to a large extent in practice — the political theory of one empire to maintain peace and the legal theory of one law for all men based on human nature, which is reason.

This had its source in Rome. The village which became the city of Rome was founded in the eighth century B.C. by a gang of outlaws. When their leader died, instead of a struggle to determine the strongest man, they resolved to invite the wisest man they knew to come to rule over them and give them laws. At least once in history, and centuries before Plato, Plato's suggestion that philosophers would make the best kings was adopted literally, by a group of unsophisticated countrymen, and with far-reaching consequences. The philosopher Numa, whose wife and *guru* was the priestess of a sacred grove, accepted the invitation, became the second king of Rome, organized civil and religious institutions, established the calendar which with slight modifications we still use, and promulgated laws which were the nucleus of the elaborate system of Roman law. As this village expanded to become the world's greatest empire, famous throughout history for the excellence of its laws, the ideal of natural law as the will of God was never lost. Enactments of the legislative assembly (*jus*) were considered interpretations of the divine will (*fas*), and the enacting formula was the question, "Is it your pleasure, Citizens, and do you hold it as the divine will that this be done?" The divine will is reason, and reason is law for man the

rational animal. As Cicero said in his *Republic*:

> There is in fact a true law — namely, right reason — which is in accordance with nature, applies to all men, and is unchangeable and eternal. By its commands this law summons men to the performance of their duties; by its prohibitions it restrains them from doing wrong. Its commands and prohibitions always influence good men, but are without effect on the bad. To invalidate this law by human legislation is never morally right, nor is it permissible ever to restrict its operation, and to annul it wholly is impossible. Neither the Senate nor the people can absolve us from our obligation to obey this law. . . . It will not lay down one rule at Rome and another at Athens, nor will it be one rule today and another tomorrow. But there will be one law, eternal and unchangeable, binding at all times upon all peoples; and there will be, as it were, one common master and ruler of men, namely God, who is the author of this law, its interpreter, and its sponsor.

Greek political and legal theory were very different. Greece was divided into small independent sovereign states normally at war with one another, although truce was respected at times of harvest and track meets. Each state had its own system of laws given by local legislators. The laws of Athens were given by Solon, those of Sparta by Lycurgus. They were not expected to be alike.

The cultural revolution of the Renaissance which inaugurated the modern age in Europe involved the substitution of Greek for Roman ideals in many realms of thought. In politics the theory of one empire gave way to that of independent sovereign kingdoms hostile to each other, with peace not the natural state but established by explicit treaties. In law the theory of natural law deriving its sanction from its intrinsic form as rational gave way to the theory of arbitrary law deriving its sanction from its extrinsic status as willed by the sovereign. When in England the actual sovereignty passed from King to Parliament, the legal theory remained the same. A new law is valid because enacted by Parliament, and from it there is no appeal except to a future Parliament. Interpretation of old laws is found in the binding precedents of past court decisions.

When the United States of America declared their independence from Great Britain, they changed their political status but retained both the detailed content of English law and the modern (that is, Greek) theory of law. The Declaration of Independence, to be sure, was based on natural law. It invokes "the laws of nature and of nature's God"; it declares it to be self-evident that all men are endowed by God with certain inalienable rights; it argues that governments denying these natural rights are therefore invalid; and it appeals to God in declaring

independence from the King. But this is a political document. Law for the new nation was formulated in the Constitution. It does not refer to God, reason, or natural rights. The people have succeeded to the supreme sovereignty exercised by the King and later by Parliament. The Constitution begins with the proclamation that "We the People of the United States ... do ordain and establish this Constitution." Its validity is derived from the will of the people. Certain civil rights are established not because natural but because enumerated in amendments proposed by Congress and ratified by the States in accordance with the procedure prescribed in the Constitution itself, and subject to repeal by future amendment.

The Constitution, by its own declaration, is the supreme law of the land, and as such it is the supreme object of loyalty, like the King in a monarchy. Americans taking oaths of loyalty, from the President at his inauguration to travellers getting passports, swear to support the Constitution. Americans visiting Washington seldom see the President but they go to see the Constitution and Declaration of Independence exhibited like crown jewels in their specially constructed vaults. The Declaration is a historical document declaring what soon became an accomplished fact, but the Constitution is the living core of the nation with a unique sacredness as well as a unique authority.

The supremacy of the Constitution is taken very seriously. In England the King can do no wrong, but in America the President can do nothing unconstitutional. Neither can Congress. Congress is not like the British Parliament. It is a creature of the Constitution, which has conferred on it legislative jurisdiction in certain specified fields. Jurisdiction in fields not so specified remains with the separate States, which are always called sovereign States. But since the Constitution is the supreme law, anything in the laws or even constitutions of the States which is in conflict with it or with acts of Congress justified by it is invalid and will not be recognized by the States' own judges, all of whom have sworn to support the Constitution of the United States.

There is no censor to determine what is or is not in accordance with the Constitution. Disputes over this issue can be resolved, therefore, only in the context of a lawsuit, which has to be decided one way or another. A judge trying a case who believes that the act of any person, even of Congress, is not compatible with the Constitution condemns that act and decides the case before him accordingly. Such cases are often appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States, which is the highest court, from which there is no further appeal. In this way the Supreme Court determines what is constitutional and unconstitutional, and lower courts follow its precedents. A statute enacted by Congress with all

proper procedure but judged to be either incompatible with the Constitution or concerned with a subject over which Congress has no authority remains on the statute book, but it cannot be enforced because the courts will not recognize it. It is the same for statutes of State legislatures and rules or orders of any government officials Federal or local.

Some recent cases are of special interest. The population of the United States is a mixture of all the races of the world. But in one section, the "South," almost all the people are of two races, Anglo-Saxon and Negro. The two groups are conspicuously different in appearance. It has always been the custom for children of the two races to attend separate schools. The legality of this segregation was recognized in a Supreme Court decision seventy years ago, with the provision that in any community the two schools must be equal in quality. In 1954 the Supreme Court considered a case where Negro children sought admission to the White school. The court found that the two schools were substantially equal in quality of instruction and physical facilities. Nevertheless, reversing its previous decision, it ruled that the schools must be integrated because segregation deprived the Negro children of the "equal protection of the laws" guaranteed by the Constitution. The court argued that segregated schools are somehow unequal even if they are equal.

The logic of the argument is unconvincing, but the principle involved is clear. America is a classless society. The class distinction of equal but separate schools was a scandalous violation of this principle. The plaintiffs demanded and the Supreme Court established not equality but integration. There is no place in American society for classes whether equal or unequal. Americans are one people.

There were many, of course, who did not like this decision, and it is common knowledge that enforcement has been difficult. Most Americans, however, approved it. As one Southern governor said, "Our conscience tells us it is right; our intellect tells us it is inevitable; the Supreme Court tells us it is the law." Even among those who approved, however, many had qualms about the procedure. If a court can reverse itself, how can there be law? Was not the Supreme Court itself violating the very first sentence of the Constitution, which states, "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States"? If school segregation is undesirable, should it not be forbidden by a legislative act of Congress or if necessary by an amendment to the Constitution, as slavery was forbidden at an earlier period? Granted segregation is bad, how is it unconstitutional? It is a far-fetched argument indeed which, from the premise that "No State shall deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws," infers the conclusion that a community must have one school for all children. Certainly

the authors of this clause, included in a constitutional amendment of 1866, had no such thought, nor did the Supreme Court in 1896, nor has social evolution since then changed the situation, for whatever change there has been has been in the direction of greater equality, not less.

A case in 1962 also involved schools. In the United States education is universal and compulsory but there are three kinds of schools — autonomous private schools supported by tuition fees, parochial schools conducted by churches, and public schools open to all children free of charge. Most children attend the public schools, which are administered by local school boards. The Federal government has nothing to do with them, and the extent to which State governments control them varies in the different States. Still, since they are supported by compulsory taxation, they are considered quasi-governmental institutions. It has always been customary to say prayers in the public schools, generally prayers agreeable to the different religions of the pupils. In the public schools of New York State a very innocuous prayer ("Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon thee, and we beg thy blessing upon us, our parents, our teachers, and our country") was recited at the beginning of each day. This could not possibly offend either Protestants or Catholics or Jews, or anyone else except extreme atheists opposed on principle to any prayer. Even so it was voluntary, and any pupil who objected, or whose parents objected, was excused from participating. When a suit initiated by atheists to forbid saying this prayer reached the Supreme Court, the court ruled that it must be forbidden as an unconstitutional violation of the principle of separation of church and state, and so established a precedent forbidding any religious act in any public school.

As might be expected, there were immediate and violent protests against this attack on religion. What might not have been expected was that the protests stopped almost entirely after a few days. On second thought the protesters, especially the leaders of the various religions, decided that it was a good decision. A proposed constitutional amendment to undo the decision is still in a congressional committee, with religious leaders speaking against it. Religious people feel generally that it is best to keep religion, a matter of heart and home and church, entirely out of the public schools, which have a different function, and where an innocuous prayer is of little or no value. But the same legal qualm arises. Perhaps public school prayer is better omitted, but how is it unconstitutional? If the segregation decision was a far-fetched argument, the prayer decision would seem to be an outrageous travesty of logic. There are three references to religion in the Constitution: no religious test shall be required for office; Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion; Congress shall not prohibit the free exercise of religion.

The Supreme Court based its decision on the second of these. But how? Congress had nothing to do with it, and nobody was trying to establish a religion. If "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion" means that school children cannot pray if they want to, then anything can mean anything.

A more recent case involves politics, a sphere the Supreme Court has traditionally avoided as outside its jurisdiction as a court of law. Most of the States have legislative assemblies consisting of two chambers, and in many one chamber represents the people by delegates elected from districts approximately equal in population while the other has delegates from geographical subdivisions regardless of population. In the latter case a representative from a county with a small population may have the same vote in the assembly as one from a county with a large population. In a suit brought by citizens of a densely populated district protesting this undemocratic arrangement the Supreme Court decided that it is not only undemocratic but unconstitutional, and that both chambers must represent the people equally. All voters must have equally efficacious votes.

This decision evoked surprisingly little protest, and the States concerned have been revising their election districts accordingly. But the legal paradox is even more striking. The segregation decision involved a far-fetched interpretation of the Constitution's equality clause and the prayer decision an outrageous *non sequitur* from its establishment-of-religion clause, but there is nothing anywhere in the Constitution which remotely suggests any ground for this decision. The Constitution says nothing about the government of the States, except that it must be republican. The Constitution does prescribe the form of the Federal government. Congress consists of two houses. The House of Representatives represents the people by representatives elected from districts approximately equal in population. The Senate represents the States by two senators from each State regardless of population. The 226,000 people of Alaska have the same voice in the Senate as the 16,000,000 people of New York. This is just what the Supreme Court declared to be unconstitutional if done by the States. Not only does the Constitution provide that the United States Senate shall not represent the people equally, but it does so with extraordinary emphasis, providing that this rule of equal representation for States regardless of population, alone among all the provisions of the Constitution, shall never be changed even by a constitutional amendment. It would seem as if the Supreme Court, in ruling a similar arrangement in the States unconstitutional, was not merely ignoring but actually opposing what the Constitution says.

How can this puzzle be solved? Certainly not by criticizing the judges of the Supreme Court, who are men of wisdom and integrity. If the Supreme Court declares to be unconstitutional that which in fact is not unconstitutional, it can only be because of an ambiguity in the meaning of the word "unconstitutional."

The meaning of words undergoes evolution, and this is especially so of words which have acquired some sort of sacredness. The American "Constitution," whatever it is, is the supreme law and object of loyalty. To be "unconstitutional" is to be illegal in the most definitive way, illegal regardless of legislation. Originally, and until recently, "constitutional" and "unconstitutional" meant just what they appear to mean — in accordance, or in conflict, with the written document called the Constitution. A judge trying a case involving a question of constitutionality would consider the relevant clause in the Constitution and decide accordingly. Certainly no such examination of the document was the basis of the three decisions discussed. The practices condemned — segregating Negro schoolchildren, introducing a religious note in secular public schools, permitting a few people in a country town to outvote many people in a city — were condemned because they are wrong, irrational, and against the dignity of human nature. But this is natural law. It seems as if the Supreme Court, at least in these cases, has been turning away from the principle of arbitrary law (and the Constitution as a document is arbitrary, based on the will of the people) toward the principle of natural law interpreted by reason. The word "unconstitutional" persists, but its meaning has changed. It means irrational or wrong.

An analogous case of change of meaning is found in the curious enacting formula of the British Parliament. An Act of Parliament becomes law only when the Clerk of Parliament, in the presence of both Houses, declares in French *Le Roi le veut* (The King wills it) — or, as at present, *La Reine le veut* (The Queen wills it). What does this mean, and why in a foreign language? Originally it meant just what it says, that the French-speaking Norman conqueror was imposing his will on the conquered English people. Today it means that the English people, acting through their elected representatives in the House of Commons, have agreed on a new law; nobody cares what opinion, if any, the Queen has about it. But the words are the same. Here, as in the Supreme Court, substantial change is made easier, and revolution unnecessary, by keeping the same ritual words for the sanction of law.

British jurisprudence, which American jurisprudence has traditionally followed, now seems to be following the American example. On 26 July 1966, the Lord Chancellor announced that hereafter the House of Lords, which is the supreme court of Great Britain, will feel free to "depart

from a previous decision when it appears right to do so." This, as *The New York Times* put it, "has the most profound philosophical implications for the law in Britain." It reverses the immemorial principle that the House is bound by its own previous decisions, which, no matter how erroneous, can be changed only by a legislative act of Parliament. It is a change from arbitrary to natural law. Law based on precedents is arbitrary law. Law based on what "appears right" is natural law. The House of Lords, less inhibited than the Supreme Court because it has no sacred constitution, only a sacred sovereign, has stated explicitly what the Supreme Court has stated implicitly in the decisions, that natural law prevails over other sources of law so that what does not appear right is not legal.

It would be far-fetched to conclude from these few cases that America is turning back from the modern theory of arbitrary law to the medieval theory of natural law. Still, these cases are interesting as steps in that direction, whether or not they indicate a trend which will prevail. Arbitrary law is parochial, but natural law based on human nature is universal, and any trend toward natural law is a contribution to world unity. The cases show at least the possibility of a new, or rather very old, approach to the philosophy of law, not by theorists but by judges in power, an approach in which the true law is, as Cicero said, right reason in accordance with nature.

GEORGE BOSWORTH BURCH

On a starred night Prince Lucifer uprose.
Tired of his dark dominion swung the fiend ...
He reached a middle height, and at the stars,
Which are the brain of heaven, he looked, and sank.
Around the ancient track marched, rank on rank,
The army of unalterable law.

—GEORGE MEREDITH

S. C. VARMA

The Way of Humanism

[Dr. S. C. Varma studied economics and sociology at Lucknow University and has been connected with it for many years as a teacher in the Department of Sociology and Social Work. He worked as a research supervisor in the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Project on "The Élites of Lucknow." In this article he gives us a general survey of the various types of humanism and their limitations and draws our attention to the hope of a complete and more balanced development of humanism offered by the theories of Jacques Maritain and Radhakamal Mukerjee.—ED.]

HUMANISM is as old as the Greek philosophers. Protagoras proclaimed, "Man is the measure of all things," and Terentius declared, "I believe that nothing human is alien to me." These ideas were echoed centuries later in Western Europe at the close of the Middle Ages, first in Italy and then in Germany, France, the Netherlands, Spain, England, and Scotland. As Goethe put it,

> Man carries within himself not only his individuality but all of humanity with all its potentialities, although he can realize those potentialities in only a limited way because of the external limitations of his individual existence.

But it was given to the German philosopher Schiller to introduce "humanism" as a technical term into philosophy. Schiller was deeply and immediately attracted by the philosophical movement of Pragmatism started by William James, who in turn had taken the term "Pragmatism" from Charles S. Pierce. In fact, Schiller wanted James to call this new movement humanism. But James said no to it on the ground that Pragmatism had taken root and hence it was too late to change its name. Schiller then used the term "humanism" for his own brand of pragmatism.

Humanism was opposed to the two dominant philosophical ideas of Schiller's times. These were (1) Absolutism, which led to the assumption of the standpoint of the whole in describing the part; and (2) Naturalism, which meant describing the real in terms of a nature in which man was treated merely as a natural phenomenon. Absolutism, it was pointed out, did not pay attention to the problems of human knowing, ignored the fact that the hypothesis of absolute knowledge and absolute reality did not assist in knowing man, and even neglected to prove the validity of the conception of the Absolute. As regards Naturalism, it ignored the influence of human activity on man's cognitive processes.

Thus humanism protested against the dehumanizing and depersonaliz-

ing procedures adopted both by absolutist metaphysics and natural science. It also attacked the intellectualistic assumptions of traditional logic, saying that the latter paid no attention to the psychological side of knowing and to the role of desires, emotions, prejudices, and volitions involved in thought processes. Further, humanism challenged the axioms of the *a priori* philosophies, interpreted truth and error in terms of consequences or effects which could be observed, denied the antithesis between theory and practice, and emphasized the empirical approach. Finally, humanism was little interested in theology and was unmindful and at times strongly critical of the Church. Later, as the influence of the Church declined, it protested also against secular orthodoxies which subordinated man to political and biological abstractions. In other words, humanism dealt with the ontological, epistemological, and axiological problems in the perspective of man. Thus, humanist ontology deals with the objects of the human world, which embraces all kinds of human activity, including sense-perception, theory-construction, and symbolizing etc., and also the physical processes of the human body. Humanist epistemology is a theory of human knowledge which says that logic should not remain confined to the investigation of the exact, purely formalized schemata of thinking, which presupposes a much more precise language than the one actually used in the empirical sciences and in daily life. And, finally, humanist axiology is a theory of concrete, historically given changeable values, and not of certain absolute and transcendental ideals and norms.

It was these ideas which made early social thought humanistic and universalistic in its outlook. In economics, Adam Smith stressed the economic and commercial interdependence of nations, denounced the British colonial system as "a manifest violation of the sacred rights of mankind," and postulated human sympathy as the guarantor of the natural rights of the individual and the basis of mutual aid between individuals, classes, and nations. The Utilitarians emphasized the happiness of the whole of mankind as the aim and purpose of social science and rational social reforms, legislation, and education. Comte postulated a religion of humanity and a world humanitarian outlook based on science and love of mankind. Marx talked of historical determination of the unity of mankind through the universal dialectical march of economic and social relations and forces. Spencer prophesied world industrialism leading to the ultimate abolition of war and promotion of the unity and peaceful progress of mankind. Durkheim talked of the collective conscience as the highest form of psychic life and god as the infinite human society worshipping itself. Hobhouse enlarged the principle of co-operation and harmony into the orderly social development of mankind. Giddings

stressed consciousness of kind as shaping all other motivations and determining the evolution of human communities. And, finally, Max Scheler thought of the unity of human nature and of the essential moral values that shape the unity and ordered progress of humanity.

So far I have only dealt with the beginnings and basic tenets of philosophical humanism and the humanistic character of the early social thought. But there are other types of humanism also, each having its own world view.

Thus, liberal humanism is the product of Renaissance humanism, which in turn was an off-shoot of Greco-Roman humanism; of Enlightenment humanism, which advanced the rich cumulative traditions of the Renaissance; and of the Reformation, the New State, and the new scientific discoveries and explorations in Europe. Liberal humanism believes in the universal reign of reason and advocates liberal education as a tool for transforming man into a fully human being.

But liberal humanism tends to overlook facts and happenings which show that reason does not play a dominant role in human affairs. In other words, liberal humanism ignores the important role played by irrational forces in the lives of individuals and groups. It also ignores the need for social and institutional changes.

Marxist humanism believes in human progress through the dialectic of the forces of social or class struggle and revolution. It treats the mode of social production, i.e. the economic system, as the foundation of the whole social superstructure, which includes political and legal institutions, religion, ethics, philosophy, etc. Marxism has induced humanism to become more conscious of the problem of alienation and of the concrete economic pressures and social conditioning of man's thinking, religion, and morality. Marxist and socialist humanism therefore stresses the need for social and institutional change as a means of overcoming alienation and the exploitation of man by man.

But to some people Marxist humanism is very disturbing as it emphasizes struggle and violence as means to the transformation of man and society and to the building up of a peaceful universal community. Besides, Marxist humanism is atheistic, shuns religion and metaphysics, and refuses to accept the idea of any transcendental or beyond-human dignity. It equates self-recovery with change in socio-economic relations and institutions; for Marxist humanism is materialistic, that is, it stresses the primacy of the material over the non-material.

Existentialist humanism emphasizes that existence precedes essence. It stresses the freedom of the individual and is therefore opposed to "systems" — political, philosophical, and moral — which tend to subordinate the individual and his creativity and spontaneity to something which

is collective and formal. Finally, existentialist humanism signifies a protest against the dehumanizing bourgeois life and values.

But the drawback of existentialist humanism is that it views life as essentially meaningless, absurd. This is why it shows excessive concern with such morbid psychological conditions as fear, dread, anguish, and nausea caused by the idea that life is meaningless, and thereby leads to hopelessness, despair, and cynicism. It is precisely this despair and cynicism which makes Sartre, the high priest of modern atheistic existentialism, declare: "Man is a hopeless passion . . . . Thus it amounts to the same thing whether one gets drunk alone or is a leader of nations."

Scientific humanism identifies man's progress with mere control and manipulation of the environment. It is attached to the enjoyment of the goods of life, which it identifies with the quality of civilization. This has led to a better understanding of the role of science and technology in the abolition of world-wide poverty and the qualitative improvement of the leisure of mankind released from manual toil and drudgery.

But scientific humanism disregards the purpose and discretion of man's real self and his relations to fellow men and cosmos. This is wrong, for, as Gabriel Marcel puts it:

> The essential aim of knowledge and life is the ordering of oneself to the cosmos, rather than exercising a transforming action in the world which man might be regarded as having to subject to his desires or needs.

Finally, evolutionary humanism emphasizes the struggle for life and has aided the understanding of the aspect of life, which makes man's career open, cosmic, and transcendent and enables him to take charge of cosmic evolution itself. But evolutionary humanism is misleading, involving as it does an opportunistic ethics which dehumanizes man and distorts relations and values.

These are the significant varieties of Western humanism. There is Eastern humanism also. It is rooted in Vedānta, Buddhism, and Confucianism. The Vedantic world view stresses that supreme reality is a vast whole, *Brahman* or Being, which is the common foundation of all cosmic manifestations and that the transcendent *Brahman* is present in each particular existence, which attains its true meaning only as it becomes a part of the whole. Buddhism preaches man's salvation through his own efforts and universal compassion for all living beings. Vedāntic and Buddhist humanism is grounded in an ontology characterized by an essentially cosmic and metaphysical orientation. Chinese humanism, on the contrary, is rooted in psychology and ethics. It is social, naturalistic, and mundane in character.

But none of these different types of humanism is complete in itself.

I have already referred to some of the defects in the major varieties of Western humanism. As regards Western humanism and Eastern humanism in general, the former, under the impact of biologism and psychologism, ignores the cosmic dimension and aspect of human life and experience — the reason why it is hedonistic, materialistic, and violent in character; while Eastern humanism ignores the value of the concrete, living individual and is devoid of a progressive ethics and the politics of social equality and justice.

It is the realization of the lop-sidedness and unbalance of these different types of humanism which has led thinkers like Jacques Maritain and Radhakamal Mukerjee to plead for a new humanism. The integral humanism of Maritain and the creative humanism of Mukerjee are based on the recognition of the fact that man is multi-dimensional and is moving towards new patterns of wholeness and universalism. These, therefore, take into account all the dimensions — individual and social, transcendent and immanent, spiritual and temporal, human and heroic — of man's life, experience, and values. Integral humanism seeks to have a creative synthesis of all the truths brought to light by different types of humanism, chiefly theocentric and anthropocentric humanism. It has nothing to do with bourgeois humanism; in fact, it aspires to change the bourgeois man. Such transformation requires a total social reconstruction, a transcendental vision of life, and a sane social philosophy and philosophy of history. The growth of the new humanism also requires what Radhakamal Mukerjee has called interfusion and intermingling of historical patterns and ideals of universal self-hood, universal moral values, and universal laws as developed in the East and the West.

To conclude: humanism has always emerged as a reaction to a threat to mankind. In the Renaissance, for example, it emerged as a protest against religious fanaticism, while in the Enlightenment it sought to counter the threat of extreme nationalism and the enslavement of man by narrow economic interests and the machine. This latter threat and the fear that man may be destroyed by things and conditions he himself has created with the help of modern science and technology have become all the more serious and real today. Man's physical and subjective existence is gravely endangered not merely by the development of power blocs and nuclear weapons but also by the dread, anxiety, despair, and cynicism which modern existentialism is spreading. The revival of humanism today is a new reaction to these dangers to mankind's survival, solidarity, happiness, and progress. But it is integral or creative humanism alone which can save mankind from the new menace.

S. C. VARMA

R. N. KAK

The Practice of Faith and Other Cardinal Virtues

[Readers will remember several articles by Shri R. N. Kak on aspects of Buddhist philosophy and tradition. In this article he gives a well-documented account of the Buddhist analysis of the nature of true faith and its relation to mindfulness, concentration, and wisdom.—ED.]

NO AMOUNT OF STUDY can bring a full understanding of the spiritual truths contained in any doctrine of a religion. An ordinary worldly man is governed by sense-based instincts and impulses. Spiritual forces take over only when sufficient progress towards leading a spiritual life has been made. A transformation of the personality is needed, for which it is necessary to cultivate the five cardinal virtues. Buddhists maintain that in the case of a spiritually developed individual these virtues, namely faith, vigour, mindfulness, concentration, and wisdom eventually dominate and shape all his deeds, thoughts, and feelings.[1] Emphasis on faith demonstrates the religious character of Buddhist thought; that on mindfulness and concentration, its Yogic basis. Wisdom is, of course, the main source of philosophical understanding.

Faith is the seed[2] from which grows the plant of spiritual insight. Faith has intellectual, volitional, emotional, and social aspects. It is much more than a mere acceptance of unproved beliefs.

Intellectually, faith is an acceptance of a doctrine for which factual evidence is not complete. Belief in order to become faith should go beyond what is known. Spiritual growth will make one aware of that which he, because of faith, took for granted. When faith is considered as an intellectual attitude its opposites are doubt and perplexity.[3] The objects of faith in Buddhism are four[4]: (i) the belief in the doctrine of Karma and rebirth; (ii) acceptance of the teachings about reality and its nature, such as the doctrines of dependent origination, "not-self," and "emptiness," and also the assertion that the world is the result of the ignorance of individuals who are non-existent with regard to objects which are non-existent; (iii) faith in the three "refuges," the Buddha, the Dharma, and the Saṅgha[5]; (iv) belief in the effects of the prescribed practices and in *Nirvāṇa* as the ultimate goal.

Volitionally, faith means a determined and courageous act of the will. It is the "striving after self-realization by concentrating the powers of

---

[1] *Visuddhimagga*, XXI. 128
[2] *Suttanipāta*, 76, 181
[3] *Visuddhimagga*, XIV. 177
[4] EDWARD CONZE (ed.): *Buddhist Texts*, 170
[5] CONZE: *Buddhist Meditation*, 45–52

the mind on a given ideal."[6] Suppose that safety lies on the other bank of the river, then the man of faith is compared[7] to the person who braves the dangers of the river by swimming across it to the other bank. Thus he saves himself and also inspires others by his example. Faith and determination are closely connected, and faith is opposed to the irresolute behaviour of a man who like a child thinks, "Shall I do it, shall I not do it?"[8]

Emotionally, faith leads to serenity and lucidity.[9] The opposite of faith is worry. A man with faith is said to lose the "five terrors." These terrors are: worry about the necessities of life, about loss of reputation, about death, about unhappy rebirth, and about the impress that one makes on others. A belief in the doctrine of Karma lightens the burdens of life. The conviction about the non-existence of a self removes all worries about persons, events, and things. If belief in one vast emptiness is firm, nothing can ever happen which may disturb us.

Socially, complete confidence in the Buddha and the Saṅgha is essential for faith. Only in the case of a monk who "in faith forsakes his home"[10] is there a complete break with the normal social environment. To a certain extent every practitioner of the Dharma has to live a little apart from his society in spirit, if not in fact. To go to the Buddha and the Saṅgha for refuge means the giving up of expectations of help from others. It is turning away from the visible and pursuing something that is elusive and invisible. One who relies on spiritual forces disregards public opinion and does not care for social discouragements. Some defiance of the world is necessary for leading a spiritual life. The man who follows the path belongs to the family of the Buddha. He has the Buddha as his father, the *Prajñāpāramitā* as his mother, and his fellow seekers as relatives and friends.[11] He has to establish satisfactory social relations with these forces, which are invisible. In such a case a capacity for renunciation is a prerequisite of faith.

Faith is also to a certain extent paradoxical, like most of the other spiritual qualities. Faith is a "gift" unobtainable by striving and is also a "virtue" capable of cultivation. Capacity for faith varies from person to person. Buddhists classify personality types according to whether they are governed by greed, hatred, or confusion.[12] The greedy are more susceptible to faith. Buddhaghosha says: "As on the unwholesome plane

---

[6] S. RADHAKRISHNAN (trs.): *Bhagavad-Gita*, 343

[7] *Visuddhimagga*, 464; CONZE: *Buddhist Scriptures*, 153

[8] *Visuddhimagga*, 466

[9] *Ibid.*, 464; CONZE: *Buddhist Scriptures*, 152–3

[10] *Aṅguttara Nikāya*, III.5

[11] D. T. SUZUKI: *Essays in Zen Buddhism*, III.133–4

[12] CONZE: *Buddhist Scriptures*, 116–21

greed clings, and takes no offence, so does faith on the wholesome plane. As greed seeks out the objects of sense-desire, so faith the virtues of morality, and so on. As greed does not let go that which is harmful, so faith that which is beneficial."[13]

Social circumstances are to a great extent responsible for fostering either faith or unbelief. In modern society there is a distrust for tradition. Smartness is in fashion and faith is supposed to indicate a weak head. The distractions of the sensory world have been multiplied to such an extent that the peace of the invisible or transcendental world is difficult to achieve. The number of conflicting viewpoints to which a citizen is exposed are so many that it becomes impossible for him to make a choice. The prestige of science also acts as an enemy of the virtue of faith.

Faith as a virtue is built up by discipline rather than by discussion of various opinions. Every doctrine is subject to inescapable doubts, and finally it is character that determines how these are tackled. To some the evidence for a belief in Karma and rebirth seems imposing.[14] To others this evidence seems negligible. Scientifically, of course, the evidence will always be inconclusive. The doctrine of Karma makes two assumptions that are scientifically unverifiable: (1) behind the natural causality observed in nature, there is moral causality which makes sure that good acts are rewarded and bad actions punished; and (2) this chain of moral causality is not interrupted by death, but continues from one life to another. This has to be accepted on faith and faith alone. This can become a matter of personal experience only for those who have gained the two super-knowledges (*abhijñā*): the recollection of one's own rebirths and those of others.[15] The only way of effectively silencing one's doubts is to purify oneself so that one may become worthy of higher knowledge.

Here a warning has to be given. The balance of the powers of the mind is an essential Buddhist virtue.[16] Faith when carried to excess and untempered by wisdom is liable to become mere credulity. Similarly an excess of vigour endangers tranquillity, and therefore it should be restrained by concentration. Faith gives rise to emotional excitement, and vigour to the excitement of doing and wanting to do more, sometimes to the doing of much more than what is desirable. Both these virtues, in order to remain virtues, have to be restrained by their counterparts, wisdom and tranquil concentration.

---

[13] *Visuddhimagga*, III.75

[14] CHRISTMAS HUMPHREYS: *Karma and Rebirth* (1942)

[15] CONZE: *Buddhist Scriptures*, pp. 131–3

[16] *Visuddhimagga*, 150–1

The virtue of mindfulness does not suffer from any such disability. It should be strong everywhere and no amount of mindfulness can ever be in excess:

> The Lord has declared mindfulness to be useful everywhere. For the mind finds refuge in mindfulness and mindfulness is its protector. Without mindfulness there can be no exertion or restraint of the mind.[17]

It is in Buddhism alone that mindfulness occupies a central position. Mindfulness is the third of the five virtues, seventh of the steps of the Noble Eightfold Path, and the first of the seven limbs of enlightenment. In the *Sātipaṭṭhāṇasūtta*[18] it is said that

> the four applications of mindfulness are the one and only way (*ekayano*) that leads beings to purity, to the transcending of sorrow and lamentation, to the appeasement of pain and sadness, to entrance upon the right method and to the realization of Nirvāṇa.[19]

According to Yogic tradition the mind is supposed to consist of two parts: the surface of the mind which is disturbed and the innermost depth which is quiet and calm. The deep calm within which is beyond the conscious and the unconscious mind as understood by the psychologists is so enveloped by the disturbed and turbulent surface that most men are incredulous when told about this centre of inmost stillness. It is difficult for people to realize the peace that lies within them.

Mindfulness and concentration are the two virtues which help in the discovery and realization of this inward calm. The measures that we take to protect the feeling of inward peace and calm which slowly but surely grows within us are given the name of mindfulness. By the practice of mindfulness and concentration, the principal enemies of spiritual quietude, the senses, the passions, egoistic notions, and discursive thinking, are all kept out of this domain of inward calm. The "restraint of the senses" is one of the exercises grouped under the heading of mindfulness and has the greatest philosophical interest.[20] Concentration (*samādhi*) increases our capacity to regain the perfect peace which lies dormant within us. Concentration considered as a spiritual virtue as distinct from trances (*dhyāna*) and the four formless attainments (*arupya-samāpatti*) which shift our attention from the world of sense to the subtler spiritual world. Basically, the practice that leads to concentration is a training in increasing introversion, which is achieved by slowly

---

[17] *Ibid.*, IV. 49

[18] *Majjhima Nikāya*, I. 57

[19] Trs. from BHIKKHU SOMA : *The Way of Mindfulness*, 18–31

[20] CONZE : *Buddhist Scriptures*, 103–4

decreasing the effects produced on us by any kind of external stimuli.[21]

Wisdom is held to be based on concentration: it has been said, "he who is concentrated knows, sees what really is."[22] When wisdom is a result of meditational development, concentration is absolutely essential. "Wisdom" is merely an approximate equivalent of *prajñā*. To ordinary men of modern times "wisdom" means prudence, sagacity, a sense of values, serenity, and understanding of the mode of operation of the world. The Buddhist concept of wisdom is similar to this, but deeper and more precise.

Wisdom has been defined thus: "Wisdom penetrates into *dharmas* as they are in themselves. It disperses the darkness of delusion, which covers up the own-being of *dharmas*."[23] A duality of mind, its peaceful depth and disturbed surface, is assumed in the case of mindfulness and concentration. In the same way wisdom presupposes a duality in all beings and things, their surface appearance and their inward real depth. Objects are not actually what they appear to be. Their *dhārmic* (*dharma* and *dhārmic* are here used in the sense in which the Abhidharmists use them) reality is enveloped by their so-called common-sense appearance. Wisdom is the ability, according to the rules of the Abhidharma, to see into the *dhārmic* reality of all things. In Buddhism, ignorance and not sin is considered to be the root of all illusion and evil. Because of this wisdom is regarded as the highest virtue.

R. N. KAK

One in whom persuasion and belief
Had ripened into faith, and faith become
A passionate intuition.

—WORDSWORTH

---

[21] For details see CONZE: *Buddhist Meditation*, 20–1, 113–18

[22] *Samyutta Nikāya*, III. 13; *Visuddhimagga*, 438

[23] *Visuddhimagga*, XIV.7

Remembering Gandhiji

The 30th of January 1948 will ever remain a never-to-be-forgotten day in the annals of India. For, on that day, in keeping with the ancient, enlightened tradition of the East, a man laid down his life after having served our "orphan humanity" for over half a century, to bear testimony once again to the triumph of the Spirit of Man over the self of matter. This was Gandhiji.

What is the Spirit of Man? To quote Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, though he uttered these words in 1958 apropos of Poet Rabindranath Tagore's ensuing birth centenary in 1961:

> [It expresses and embodies] a message of human freedom, of Man's equality, of breaking of all bonds that confine the human body and spirit, of peace and tolerance and the growth of the creative spirit in man.

For all practical purposes, however, this Spirit of Man is, over and again, a re-affirmation of the twofold truth, namely, that all Life is one and that the means justify the end. Such a cyclic, renewed re-affirmation is, indeed, necessitated by the dark tragedy which often overtakes mankind in the course of human history. By and large, the majority of people live in a world "which is broken up into fragments by narrow domestic walls" and where the basis and bulwark of existence is not integrity of character, but a burning passion to get on and to get away with it somehow. Thus, the Spirit of Man is not seldom veiled, though never vanquished, because that it can never be. For the Spirit is God and God is omnipotent — His omnipotence resting on Truth and Love and Justice. That is why, in the ultimate, Satan — a symbol of selfishness and hatred and separateness — can be cast out not by Satan but by God.

But, alas! soon after the saviours and servers of Humanity, in whom this Divine Spirit of Man the Infinite and the ardent aspirant to the Eternal is revealed and reflected, pass away, they are reduced to the finite dimensions of a lifeless statue, howsoever decked it might be by daily heaps of flowers which fade away after a few hours. In this connection, it is illuminating and interesting to note that the Persian and Urdu word *butta* (statue) is derived from Buddha! Could there be a more shameful stigma on the fair face of Man than, so to speak, to put to sleep thus the Awakened and Enlightened Ones?

The shadows of such a tragedy have already begun to fall around the hallowed name of Gandhiji. His living and luminous message, which was vibrant with the vision and vitality of Truth, is being entombed mostly in statues and *samgrahālayas* (museums). It is being forgotten that it can energize and inspire the people only when there is introduced in our moribund society, in order to revive and renew it, a leaven and a light, in the form of men and women who are dedicated to the Eternal Verities as Gandhiji was. For the only worthy memorial to him can be installed in our hearts and not in stone or in the printed and spoken word. Otherwise we

shall always remain open to the serious charge, levelled against us by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru years ago:

> We praise the Mahatma and we pay homage to his memory, and yet we stray widely from the path he had pointed out to us. His basic lesson, that only through right means can right ends be achieved, is seldom remembered. Repeatedly, even in our generation, failure and disaster has faced the world because of wrong methods and wrong means. And yet we go round and round the self-same path, not even learning from hard experience.

As Gandhiji movingly said in one of his speeches, during the Dandi March in 1930:

> Where the means are clean there God undoubtedly is present with His blessings and where the two combine, there defeat is an impossibility.

May we all, then, have the wisdom and courage to live by this supreme and sovereign testament of his shining faith!

Our reverent salutation to Gandhiji, a prophet of ethical purity, purpose, and performance!

GURDIAL MALLIK

THE man who truly loves his neighbour, therefore loves also his enemy ... . We think that it is impossible for a man to love his enemy, alas!, for enemies can hardly bear to look at each other. Oh, well, then close your eyes ... and remember the commandment that *thou shalt love,* then you love — your enemy? No, then you love your neighbour, for you do not see that he is your enemy.

—KIERKEGAARD

ROBERT WALLER

An Approach to Creative Ecology

[Mr. Robert Waller is the Editor of *Mother Earth,* the journal of the Soil Association. He has been a B.B.C. producer of agricultural and rural programmes and has edited Sir George Stapledon's *Human Ecology.*

He argues in his thoughtful article that we can only understand any form of life if we take into account the whole network of its relationships with other forms of life and its environment. He argues that much of the fragmentariness of our knowledge and industrial life comes precisely from trying to find a specific fundamentally isolated part instead of taking into account the whole of life and its immanent purpose.

The second part of this long article will appear next month.—ED.]

I

MODERN SCIENCE has led to the absurd situation in which the whole is regarded as of less importance than the part: fundamental research is concerned with the lowest possible observable element, the submicroscopic, the subcellular, while the investigation of how life manifests itself as a whole is considered an occupation for cranks.

The value of ecology is that, alone of the respectable studies, it attempts to study organisms in relation to their environment: the pattern of the whole.

The processes of nature are inexhaustible, so that ecology, like any other study, can lose its nerve and become lost in an infinite, regressive analysis. The idea of an ultimate particle from which everything has grown, or to which everything else can be related in a fundamental way, seduces our minds with a hope of security, a kind of final revelation of truth. But fundamental science is as potty as fundamental religion and has similar psychological motives — though I doubt if many of our physicists and chemists have ever given this a moment's consideration!

The search for the ultimate in nature is a delusion: sooner or later it will have to be abandoned and a new attitude of mind will take its place. The ecological attitude is, in fact, already doing this. The age of analysis, now, as it were, standing forlornly in the empty space where the centre of the onion should have been, has provided us with litter bins of facts which pile up in the vacant spaces of our bookshops, encyclopedias and students' brains, just as the litter from our industrial processes disfigures the few vacant spaces left in the countryside. What can we do with it? Curiously enough, in both cases, the cause of biological form disintegrating into litter is that we have lost our sense of the whole in our passionate search for the fundamental part. If we could regain our vision of the

whole, we could magically return our intellectual and industrial litter once more into the stream of life.

In adopting a new attitude of mind it is essential not to lose one's nerve: unfamiliar ideas excite apprehension, especially when they have been vaguely associated with mystical speculations. Even the most rational will have to listen patiently to ideas which make him fidget nervously in case he is being unduly credulous; for we have to look back in history for a new starting point. While it is true that ecology leads naturally out of biology, we need a wider vision than that if ecology is to provide the framework of a philosophy to guide science. In the rest of this essay I will hint at the kind of imaginative speculations with which we must explore the creative potentialities of ecology.

Ecology is the study of the interrelationships of an organism with its environment: not only is every organism in need of an environment, but it is itself the environment of other organisms. The stomach is the environment, but it is itself the environment of other organisms. The stomach is the environment of the intestines and the intestines are the environment of bacteria which break down the waste products of the intestinal metabolism so that they become in time the environment of plant life — and so on in an inexhaustible complexity of interlocked processes, each one of which is a whole in itself and a part of something greater than itself. Ecological thinking does not say, "Life is ultimately only chemicals"; it says, "Chemicals are ultimately only the agents of life" — just as a film, while it appears to exist totally on its own account, is in fact the expression of the film-makers, whose art has lain in making themselves invisible. We should think an audience that considered a film had made itself pretty unsophisticated. And yet, if they had never had any experience of films, such a belief would be credible. Most of our scientists are like a film audience of inexperienced yokels who believe that a film is making itself before their eyes.

Nature is a skilled ecologist: for it has created the environment which the life-bearing organisms need for their survival. If we assume that life has a purpose beyond that of mere survival, then we must ask how that purpose might be manifested. The greatest art conceals its meaning within the surface pattern of events, so that the naive have no comprehension of where its greatness lies and yet may be enthralled by it. So it is perhaps with man's relationship to his own environment, that mysterious scene which stretches all around him from childhood: when he loses the childhood sense of wonder perhaps he loses the greatest gift given to him by nature for the interpretation of the meaning of existence. If there is a purpose in life, surely it must be represented in the relationship between man's natural endowments and the world in which he has

been placed. For what purpose does man, unlike other creations, have knowledge of his own existence and the capacity to reflect on his own responses to his environment? Thus we can have two kinds of ecology — natural and human ecology.

Evolutionary theory does not account for the development of consciousness so that it excludes the possibility of human ecology: it is concerned only with the adaptation of the physical organism to its environment. But suppose the higher organisms have to adapt themselves to the interior environment of their own psyche as well as to the exterior physical environment? If the exterior environment is so unsuitable to the interior psychic environment that it is starved, then the more perfect the adaptation the more likely the final extinction of the organism.

Sir Alistair Hardy, the distinguished evolutionary theorist who is by no means unorthodox, has recently posed this possibility in his Gifford Lecture, *The Living Stream*. Less orthodox thinkers like Owen Barfield and E. L. Grant raised it many years ago, but received the silent treatment reserved for those who anticipate a change in outlook. Sir Alistair is deeply involved in aligning his religious beliefs with his scientific knowledge and training and is thus, to his own occasional embarrassment, playing out in a modern setting the themes of ancient myths.

Unlike the modern world, the ancient world was convinced that nothing happens by chance, but everything is part of a supernatural drama, such as we find, for instance, in Homer. To attempt to describe how a purposeless universe works is the unique logical feat of modern science and it runs counter to our instinctive nature and our cultural inheritance. Whether this attitude of mind is right or wrong, it must set up tremendous inner tensions and conflicts and create a condition of deep psychological anxiety. This maladaptation of the psyche to the cultural environment we call neurosis and every psychiatrist has to answer to his own satisfaction whether it is the psyche or the environment that is in need of change. Until there is a philosophic decision on this, psychiatry cannot effect lasting cures. Psychiatry is the science most urgently confronted by the dilemma arising from an apparent conflict between the need for science to be without preconceptions and the fact that we cannot carry on indefinitely in a purposeless universe: science like religion is ultimately based upon faith — but dare not admit it, for it seems as if in doing so it is sacrificing its impartiality.

We need an examination of the history of the idea of purpose in life.

The myth of creation as found in the book of Genesis assumes from the beginning that God created the universe with a purpose in view and everything in it has a specific function in the divine intention. "And to every thing ... wherein there is life I have given every green herb

for meat ..." and so on. Man is created out of the dust after it has been fertilized by a mist (thus recognizing the creative power of water which plays so large a part in ancient philosophy)[1] and God breathes a soul into him afterwards. Woman is then created out of man's rib as a companion in the Garden of Eden.

The life of the first pair of humans is paradisal but it is not unconditional. They are forbidden to eat of two trees — the Tree of Knowledge and the Tree of Life (immortality). (It would appear from the Gilgamesh myth that at one time it was believed that a tree bestowing immortality actually existed: Gilgamesh went in search of it.) By the time it is incorporated in the Old Testament, we feel that this myth has become sophisticated and the meaning is more symbolic than it was originally. (In a sense it was always symbolic, of course: but man took time to become aware of his own symbolic mental processes and confused them with literal events.)

The Genesis myth goes on to relate how the woman was beguiled by a serpent into eating the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge: her eyes were opened and she knew about death. (A serpent has no eyelids and is therefore the symbol of conscious awareness — as in dreams today.) As a punishment God removed the Tree of Life, so that man could not become immortal like the gods (Genesis here refers to "become like one of us"). Man has a terrible anxiety about exceeding his place in creation.

ROBERT WALLER

(*To be concluded*)

---

[1] The first scientific generalization that we know makes water the fundamental source of life : the role played by the hydrogen atom in molecular physics would make it possible to present this theory in modern dress. But it is folly to look to the innermost structure as the key to the mystery of creation. The truth vanishes before us in high abstractions.

(For an account of this process see E. L. GRANT WASTON : *The Mystery of Physical Life*, Abelard-Schumann, London, p.53.)

ALUN LLEWELLYN

The Geometry of Thought

[Mr. Alun Llewellyn links this essay with his earlier argument in "The Justice in Nature" and "The Epic Inspiration." The three articles represent an impressive outline of the quality of early human thought. That thought was simultaneously astronomical and metaphysical and the very shape of the human mind as we know it has been so profoundly influenced by it that there is some justification for believing in the significance of the widespread myths which represent humanity as learning in its infancy from a semi-divine Teacher. Readers will find it of great interest to consider Mr. Llewellyn's selection of verses from the Book of Dzyan. Madame Blatvatsky's monumental work *The Secret Doctrine* is a commentary on this sacred and ancient work.—ED.]

IN MAKING any estimate of the stature of early thought it is essential to realize how profoundly that thought was influenced by its analysis of the measured movement of the heavens. There is no doubt that the mathematical system of the first civilization was both intelligent and complex, logical and practical. Its techniques, in contrast with our own, were constructional in method and its philosophy, similarly, can be not inadequately described as architectural in concept and in effect. What must have begun as an enquiry of wonder and curiosity resulted in a concrete appreciation of things. And this remained as the firm foundation for speculative theories which, however mythopoeic their expression, never lost that basis.

The Pythagoreans did not make a mystique out of "numbers" but found by applied analysis an ordered relationship in the actual structure of the living world. In the same way, Anaximander did not, as he is accused of having done, adjust his calculations of the distance from Earth of the several heavenly bodies to a poetic assumption of the virtues in arithmetical progression. He did so by way of adapting the fundamental association of the 360 divisions of Time to the 360 degrees of Space which was found so entirely just, from the earliest point of their discovery, that they remain indissolubly the same in the measurements used throughout the modern world and form the essential basis of science and industrial method.

Early philosophers and early technicians equally established their systems on what they actually saw and could test in practice. But, for that very reason, they were able to apply an accuracy of deduction which anticipated what modern science has either confirmed or re-accepted. The theory of Relativity has restored the concept of an enclosed infinity and of Being held suspended in Non-Being, as it is also prepared to admit

that, while early thought preferred the idea of Earth as the centre of the planets to the heliocentric theory of which it was also aware, that preference is in many respects quite valid. And if the "atoms" of which they speculated were not in kind the same as those with which we have become familiar, the principle was justified. So too, the tension of balanced opposites, by which Ionian philosophy explained the equilibrium of the Universe, and Aristotle's explanation of the heavenly bodies as points of intense fire held in place by the force of intense "frost" seem to represent conclusions which modern thought is only beginning to reach.

From the point of view of human observation, it is well known that the positions taken up by the constellations at a determined point of time are repeated, with the same orientation, at intervals of 30 days with a lapse of 2 hours. The original positions, at the same point of time exactly, are recovered at the end of the year. This formed the first 12 "monthly" periods making 360 of such "days" and the first adjustment of 12 two-hourly divisions to constitute the 24-hour total that comprises the full day. The parallel discovery that, during the same period, the sun rises and sets 365 times was subject to several solutions. The best known was the ancient Egyptian device of leaving the extra five days as a blank period, treated as holiday, at the year's end; which emphasizes the relatively older and more effective system accepted from the stars. The Etruscans, on the other hand, adopted the highly sophisticated practice of using "skip" or "rest" counts at the four points of Winter and Summer Solstice, and Autumn and Spring Equinox, which enabled the two systems to be reconciled; the ultimate effect of introducing the Ides into each month is famous. It was a Leap-Day practice suitable to be represented by ceremonial dance.

The four points of Solstice and Equinox had a parallel in the four cardinal points of the compass and broadly corresponded with them in the order of Time. The circular movement of the heavenly bodies and the quarterings imposed by these major positions in time and space created both geometry and mathematics. The 4 points divided the basic figures of 360 into sections of 90; the separate circles of movement detectable in the system of the fixed stars, in that of the planets, in the outer horizon of Ocean and the limits of the Shore seemed to imply a regular progression in the judgement of their relative distances. So, Anaximander, taking 1 for Earth, chooses 9, 18, 27 for the several margins of space beyond Earth; and Heraclitus, calculating the age of the Universe within the circle of the night beyond the stars, uses 36 as the further figure multiplied by the 3 which was a quarter of the 12 stages in the movement of the yearly cycle of stars. It was an exercise in mathematical logic. For Time, in its universal sense, was reckoned to run back and forth through

the 4 circles of Creation in its course of construction, destruction, and re-creation. The *Yugas* of Hindu philosophy are, like those of Heraclitus, a reasoned deduction from the basic figures which dominate the mystery of an ordered Universe.

Here, it is more important to note that thought did not confine itself to the simpler ideas of the Circle and the Square, vital as these were in themselves. It went further to grasp the concepts of the Sphere and the Cube. There were 6 directions to be considered; forward and backward, upward and downward, left and rightward.

Analysis went towards wider aspects. The cold unity of the Firmament contrasted with the relatively freer movements of the seven planets (which included both sun and moon). Order, therefore, bore the principle of the free Soul from itself; the sphere of the Firmament, which was simple Being, shed from itself in its turning the sphere of the Animate, that in succession threw off the Body of this Earth, an Earth generating at last the Birth-and-Death which is Man. But since these spheres of existence were linked one with the other in a vital unity (as the theory expounded by Lucretius implies) they jointly formed a great Spiral (serpent-like). The idea may well have been born from study of the course of the constellations through the year, which apparently unwinds from the central point of the Pole, spiralling below the horizon to return again. That this Spiral belongs to the earliest speculation on the nature of the universe seems to be confirmed by the allegorical use of the symbol of a Serpent in several ancient religions and by the preservation of the spiral form in, for example, the Phaestos Disc discovered in Crete and in many decorative designs of the Minoan and Celtic period. It offers an explanation of the metaphor of the thread of Ariadne in the Labyrinth and the thread with which Daedalus, its architect, had to penetrate a spiral sea-shell. It can also be argued that it explains the peculiar structure of the Pyramid, squared as it was to the cardinal points and representing the Spiral by squaring the Cone.

Its major function, however, was in suggesting the means of correlating the measured movement of the skies of night in their precise divisions with the level plane of men's observation of the horizon in which they themselves moved. The two fixed points in space were the Pole, centre of the heavens, and the human eye, centre of the mind. The line connecting them was the axis upon which the degrees of space and the divisions of time both turned. The system first developed is in absolute essentials the one still used today, since the sky and the terrestrial globe are schematically divided alike by the Polar, Tropic and Equatorial circles. It is, of course, the system projected in Plato's well-known Myth of Er, the "crystalline" spindle on which it revolves being the imaginary line from the

centre of the mind to the centre of the skies. The swing of the constellations below the earthly horizon was represented by two overlapping circles, shaping the spiral like a figure of eight; and the radial lines which mapped the 12 sections of time among the stars, when laid over the similar 12 lines demarcating the main divisions of the degrees of space on land and sea, automatically created the equilateral triangle, its bi-section, and the rectangle.

The balanced and fated design into which the motion and the mathematics of Creation fell itself created both the method of science and the faith of religion. The intellectual effort to which man was inspired in the attempt to master its meaning is the origin of his stature as Man. His powers of logic, deduction, and analysis, his techniques, his laws, his morals, his beliefs, and the breadth of language needed to express them, have a common origin without which his literature could not have been born or continue to live nor his society maintain itself. The origin of that society was the same for all archaic civilizations; and whatever expression one social shape or another gives to the human interpretation of the living World, it is only a variant upon the common theme.

ALUN LLEWELLYN

From *The Book of Dzyan*

STANZA I: Verse 8. Alone the one form of existence stretched boundless, infinite, causeless, in dreamless sleep; and life pulsated unconscious in universal space, throughout that all-presence which is sensed by the opened eye of the Dangma.

STANZA II: Verse 5. The seven sons were not yet born from the web of light. Darkness alone was father-mother, Svâbhâvat; and Svâbhâvat was in darkness.

Verse 6. These two are the Germ, and the Germ is one. The Universe was still concealed in the Divine thought and the Divine bosom. . . .

STANZA III: Verse 3. Darkness radiates light, and light drops one solitary ray into the mother-deep. The ray shoots through the virgin egg, the ray causes the eternal egg to thrill, and drop the non-eternal germ, which condenses into the world-egg.

Verse 9. Light is cold flame, and flame is fire, and fire produces heat, which yields water: the water of life in the great mother.

STANZA IV: Verse 3. From the effulgency of light — the ray of the ever-darkness — sprung in space the re-awakened energies; the one from the egg, the six, and the five. Then the three, the one, the four, the one, the five — the twice seven the sum total. And these are the essences, the flames, the elements, the builders, the numbers, the arupa, the rupa, and the force of Divine Man — the sum total. And from the Divine Man emanated the

forms, the sparks, the sacred animals, and the messengers of the sacred fathers within the holy four.

Verse 5. "Darkness" the boundless, or the non-number, Odi-Nidana Svâbhâvat: —

I. The Adi-Sanat, the number, for he is one.

II. The voice of the Lord Svâbhâvat, the numbers, for he is one and nine.

III. The "formless square."

And these three enclosed within the O are the sacred four; and the ten are the arupa universe. Then come the "sons," the seven fighters, the one, the eighth left out, and his breath which is the light-maker.

STANZA V: Verse 4. Fohat traces spiral lines to unite the sixth to the seventh — the crown; an army of the Sons of Light stands at each angle, and the Lipika in the middle wheel. They say: This is good, the first Divine world is ready, the first is now the second. Then the "Divine Arupa" reflects itself in Chhaya Loka, the first garment of the Anupadaka.

Verse 5. Fohat takes five strides and builds a winged wheel at each corner of the square, for the four holy ones and their armies.

Verse 6. The Lipika circumscribe the triangle, the first one, the cube, the second one, and the pentacle within the egg. It is the ring called "Pass Not" for those who descend and ascend. Also for those who during the Kalpa are progressing towards the great day "Be with us." Thus were formed the Rupa and the Arupa: from one light seven lights; from each of the seven, seven times seven lights. The wheels watch the ring. . . .

STANZA VI: Verse 3. Of the Seven — first one manifested, six concealed; two manifested, five concealed; three manifested, four concealed; four produced, three hidden; four and one tsan revealed, two and one half concealed; six to be manifested, one laid aside. Lastly, seven small wheels revolving; one giving birth to the other.

Verse 4. He builds them in the likeness of older wheels, placing them on the Imperishable Centres.

How does Fohat build them? He collects the fiery dust. He makes balls of fire, runs through them, and round them, infusing life thereinto, then sets them into motion; some one way, some the other way. They are cold, he makes them hot. They are dry, he makes them moist. They shine, he fans and cools them. Thus acts Fohat from one twilight to the other, during Seven Eternities.

STANZA VII: Verse 1. Behold the beginning of sentient formless life.

First the Divine, the one from the Mother-Spirit; then the Spiritual; the three from the one, the four from the one, and the five from which the three, the five and the seven. These are the three-fold, the four-fold downward; the "mind-born" sons of the first Lord; the shining seven.

It is they who are thou, me, him, oh Lanoo. They, who watch over thee, and thy mother earth.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY: *The Secret Doctrine*

JOHN AINSWORTH

Are You God?

[We are glad to welcome to our pages Mr. John Ainsworth, who is a young English writer concerned above all with religion in the sense in which it permeates all life. He has spent some years in West Africa and in Malaya and has become a practising Buddhist. Buddhism, he feels, gives a clearer understanding of both Christianity and Hinduism, and he considers that the same truth is to be found in all great religions, especially in the writings of mystics all over the world.

The article presents a closely reasoned and direct argument to show that God or Reality cannot be separate from us. We have somehow to make the mystical leap from our egoistic sense of self to an apprehension of the Self of all Creatures as our real being.—ED.]

WHEN I speak of Reality I mean the basic fact of our existence. To me Reality is unchanging — if it were subject to its environment it would be under the control of something greater than itself and, therefore, would not be Reality. It is the same today as it was yesterday and will be tomorrow; so Reality is eternal. For much the same reasons it is the same here in England as it is in, say, Iceland or even on the furthest star. Reality, therefore, is infinite. As it is eternal and infinite it is uncreated. If "something" had created Reality there would then have to be a greater Reality behind this *basic* Reality, which is clearly impossible. Reality exists everywhere and at all times; in other words Reality IS.

Now is there anything else that could be defined in the same way? Of course there is. God also is eternal and infinite. God also is uncreated. Now as it is not possible — by definition — to have two entirely separate Realities we have little option but to agree that God *is* Reality, and that Reality *is* God. However, when we refer to God, whether it be in everyday speech or through the medium of prayer or psalm, we consistently assign "Him" to some ephemeral region beyond and away from ourselves. In other words we regard ourselves as being separate from God; which consigns God or us, or even both, to an existence apart from Reality.

We believe that our most noble aim is to be united with God or, if you prefer it, with Reality. And, in the same breath, we have assumed — as a result of appearances — that we have a distinct existence away from this basic Reality. Let us attempt to find out, not whether God *could* have any deeper connections with us, but whether there is any possibility that "He" could *not*.

If God is infinite it must mean that "He" is everywhere; and not only in external objects, such as a church, a flower, or a chair (if you deny that God is an intrinsic part of the chair then you deny that chair

existence in Reality) but also in each small letter on this page. If the reader claims to "have" any Reality then that Reality means that his basis IS God. His thoughts, his ambitions, even the excretions of the body and mind, down to his worst thoughts and actions, must be in God — *if* they are in any way real.

To whom then does the worshipper pray? And against whom does the blasphemer blaspheme? To and against nobody and nothing, but in ignorance of his true being! His prayers and supplications, his hymns and psalms of praise, do not in any way change the eternal and infinite. Even were he to swear allegiance to the devil, and spit on the cross and break it, *God* would not blink a proverbial eyelid!

The only person he would, in any way, affect — apart from those who witnessed his actions — would be himself; and this only because he professes himself to be separate from his fellow human beings and from God and Reality. Why is it then that we consider ourselves to be disconnected, so to speak?

Each leaf on the tree *appears* to be separate from every other leaf — and in one sense it very nearly is — yet, from our objective standpoint, we can see that each leaf has the tree as its basis and is, in fact, a *part* of that tree and therefore, a part of every other leaf. If the leaf were to be cut away from the tree it would wither and die — it is unable to live *apart* from its basis.

Just as the leaf *appears* to be distinct from its fellows, so also do we; and in our ignorance we fail to see that our very life depends on and *is* our common basis in Reality. You may feel that you are, at least, an individual physically; and, to a certain extent, you are. But are *you, basically,* the physical body?

The basis of our being must exist during all the states that we commonly experience during our lifetime on this earth (forget death and the question of a life hereafter; let us deal with things of which we have direct knowledge). These states, common to all of us, are: the state of deep dreamless sleep, the dream state, and the waking state. If any part of our accepted being is not in evidence during any of these conditions we can be sure that it is not a direct manifestation of the basic Reality. The basis of our being must, therefore, be a state that underlies all three of the above states. But during deep dreamless sleep the physical body no longer exists for the sleeper, and yet a form of *consciousness* does exist: in this state of sleep, we are far from being unhappy or depressed; in fact it has always been accepted that we experience a peace that is usually absent from either the dream or the waking state. Therefore the waking *feeling* that "I" am the body is false. This can also be applied to thoughts, and to emotions issuing from the

normal consciousness. "You" are still in existence when your thoughts and emotions are suspended, i.e. during deep sleep again, unconsciousness, cataleptic trance, or during a deep, but *conscious,* meditative trance.

It would appear then that this underlying basis of our being (could it be termed the state from which the original "I" issues?) is not generally known to the majority of us. Yet it has been asserted — at all times during our history and in many different countries of the world — by sages and saints who profess to have experienced this state consciously, that it *is* the basic Reality. And now, during the last one hundred years or so, physical scientists, as well as philosophers and psychologists, are becoming more and more aware that there is *something* unchanging which is at the root of our very being — whether it be termed Basic Energy, Reality, God, or whatever.

Therefore, as God — by our own definition — is Reality, our Real Fundamental is *God.* And our separate existence has come about from the false logic that because we *appear* to be separate we must *be* separate.

But what if our basis is not in an unswerving unchanging Reality? If that is the case there is little, if any, point in dicussing it because we could have, basically, no Real existence at all!

The difficulty is that we fail to *realize* that, *as* entirely separate entities, we can have no real meaning to our lives and no existence in Reality.

If, then, we are all the same anyway what is the point of praying and going to a service of worship? Firstly it takes our minds away from everyday worries and troubles. Secondly when we set about speaking to God through prayer, it puts us in a position to realize our own faults and weaknesses, and *we* give ourselves the strength to do something about them. Thirdly it helps us feel that perhaps there is a little more to life than our own petty desires and ambitions; and so, eventually, we start looking for God — or Reality. But we so often look in the wrong places. Instead of looking for God in some super-father-figure we need the courage to look deeply and honestly into our very selves, and we shall find that all along we have been, and are — even at this very moment — God.

Surely this helps us to understand a little more when it is said that we are made "in God's image," that "the kingdom of heaven is within you," that "I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." And finally that the soul is immortal and eternal; *not* our individual egos but our *soul — God.*

JOHN AINSWORTH

New Books and Old

A Modern Interpretation of Buddhism*

THE PREFACE to the book begins with these characteristic sentences which fairly epitomize its main objective:

> Let it be admitted at the outset that I have tried to write a convincing modern interpretation of the teachings of the Buddha. I have written out of a conviction that Buddhism, especially in its early Theravada sources, has something significant to say to modern man. It seems to me that the West provides new ground for an appreciative understanding of what the Buddha taught.

The author has drawn upon concepts and points of view now current in Western thought from Pragmatism, Existentialism, Logical Empiricism, and Freudianism, and uses them as background material for elucidating the teachings of the Buddha to Western readers. He has also a particularly illuminating chapter on the Buddha and Hume, with which the book concludes.

In the first two chapters, the author emphasizes the fact that the teaching of the Buddha is not a system of doctrine or a group of theories about the self, suffering, and Nirvāṇa. Buddhism is essentially a Way, a Path, "a behavioural technique for coming to grips with life's deepest problems." No sacred book, no rituals and austerities, no teacher, can take the aspirant to the goal. Each man must find the path for himself and work out his salvation with diligence. The ultimate test of truth is personal experience, as the Pragmatists would readily agree. In his advice to the Kalamas the Buddha exhorts them not to be misled by report or tradition or hearsay; nor yet by mere logic or inference; or respect for him personally. The ultimate test in every case is individual experience. On another occasion be spoke of his teaching as a raft which carries a man to the farther shore; when the crossing has been accomplished the raft should be cast aside.

All this sounds so similar to the teachings of Pragmatists and Existentialists — particularly the latter, who want to cut man loose from the strings of the established order of life. A further common point emphasized both by the Existentialists and the Buddha is the sense of frustration or anxiety which is at the core of all conscious life. The Existentialists call for a complete break from the past and pin their hope on a leap of faith or unfettered free activity for overcoming the frustration which is at the heart of life. Freudians on the contrary want a fresh enrichment, broadening, and deepening of the Self in order to eliminate these tensions and strains. The Marxians call for a sudden lifting of men to a new level through a proletarian revolution and a new order of society.

The solution offered by the Buddha is both pragmatic and revolutionary. It is revolutionary in the sense that the very existence of a permanent, unchanging self is denied; and the frustrations and anguish with which we identify ourselves are due to *avidyā* and the *tanhā*, which are both the cause and the effect of such ignorance. It is pragmatic in the sense that the illusion of a permanent self cannot be got rid of by theorizing and conceptual thinking, but only through a process of meditation and *samādhi* by which enlightenment is achieved and the sense of pain and anguish finally eliminated.

The author devotes two important chapters of the book to a detailed description of meditational disciplines

---

* *Buddhism : The Religion of Analysis.* By NOLAN PLINY JACOBSON. (George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London. 202 pp. 1966. 25s.)

evolved by the Theravāda and *Satipaṭṭhāṇa* schools of Ceylon and Burma. He draws largely on Buddhaghosha's *Visuddhimagga* for his illuminating account of the meditational practices of the Theravāda school.

The next chapter naturally takes him on to the subject of Nirvāṇa, which he calls "The Consummatory Experience." He presents the viewpoints of two contemporary Buddhists: Francis Story, an Englishman now living in Ceylon, and U Thittila, a Burmese *Bhikkhu* whose views on the fundamental principles of Theravāda appear in an anthology edited by Kenneth W. Morgan, *The Path of the Buddha*. Both these scholars emphasize the fact that Nirvāṇa is not a state of nothingness or annihilation, merely because we cannot describe it in words or collate it with our worldly knowledge. Nirvāṇa is a state of enlightenment and peace. It is

> a dynamic release of all the powers of personality from pride systems, lust, ego-centred drives, and the one-sided goals and goods which dominate the unenlightened human scene. ... [Nirvana] is an adventure in human fulfilment. The experience of this dynamic deliverance constitutes the victory over anxiety and fear.

The last chapter deals with the points of similarity and difference between the teachings of the Buddha and the philosophical standpoint of David Hume. Western scholars have frequently emphasized the points of similarity between them; but according to Mr. Jacobson the two philosophies differ more than they resemble one another. The points of obvious resemblance are the denial of a permanent self (the *anatta* doctrine) and the important role of the passions in the knowledge of the self and the world (the idea of *tanhā*). Hume's entire argument is that sense perception is the one and only means of gaining knowledge, and on this basis it is impossible to reach any satisfactory conclusion as to the nature of the self. The Buddha on the contrary held that sense experience is not a reliable guide in arriving at ultimate truth and that it should be transcended by *samādhi* and *Prajñā* for the attainment of the state of Nirvāṇa, which is at once bliss and enlightenment.

Altogether this book is a valuable and eloquently written introduction to the teaching of the Master from the standpoint of a scholar familiar with the philosophical and scientific traditions of the West. The claim of the author that he has written a convincing modern interpretation of the teachings of the Buddha is fully substantiated and the book deserves a wide circle of readers both here and abroad.

B. V. NARAYANA REDDY

The Lost Dimension. By HUGH I'ANSON FAUSSET. (Stuart and Watkins, London. 80 pp. 1966. 18*s*. 6*d*.)

This last book from the pen of Hugh I'Anson Fausset will be eagerly welcomed by readers of THE ARYAN PATH, to which, for over thirty years, he was an outstanding contributor.* Illness, alas, cut it short, but one does not think of quantity when the quality is so fine, the wisdom so profound. The lost dimension is, of course, that of "spiritual experience and true being," only to be recovered by knowledge of the real (which lies latent in our unawakened state).

"At Home with the Unconscious" reviews the relationship, in this age of over-acquisitive intellectualism, between the mind and the true enlightenment which it should be our prime object to attain. With special reference to the "inner conflicts and dilemmas of divided Western man," Mr. Fausset ponders

* We had the honour of publishing the following in 1964–5: "At Home With the Unconscious" (May 1964), "At Home With the Unconscious: Further Reflections" (June 1964), "The Existential Protest" (January 1965), "Heidegger and Others" (March 1965).—ED.

how best to extend and deepen consciousness "by breaking down all that divides it from that infinite centre of knowing and being" in which release can be found from the false self that egoism and misused circumstance have created.

"Existence and Being" gives his views on Existentialism, a subject which he treats of here for the first time, not wholly without sympathy, seeing it as an attempt to affirm "man's distinctive humanity" in a world devalued by science and a "one-sided rationalism." But, having drawn his own life's inspiration so richly from the ancient wisdom of the East, he cannot but regard these modern philosophers as "far outside the heavenly dimension."

"The Way of Holiness," of which Isaiah spoke, gives its title to the concluding section. It is the way, not of rarefied saintliness but of the human lot, not to be covered "by any acrobatic leap of the spirit," but by patient progress away from self-centredness, mainly through what the Buddha called "mindfulness," till every level of our being is in order and harmony.

Integration was ever a key-word in Mr. Fausset's teaching and this small book exemplifies it well, weaving the various themes that were dear to him into a luminous whole. Any writer might be thankful to speak last words of such grave beauty and to have been so faithful throughout a lifetime to his vision of Truth.

JOAN N. BURNETT

The Petition to Rām: Hindi Devotional Hymns of the Seventeenth Century. By TULSI DAS. A Translation of *Vinaya-patrikā* with Introduction, Notes, and Glossary by F. R. ALLCHIN. (George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London. 335 pp. Frontispiece. 1966. 48*s*.)

No brief review could do justice to this monumental volume, which fills a marked gap in Western translations of Tulsi Das, whose Hindi version of the *Rāmāyaṇa* is a popular, as well as scholarly, classic. Mr. Allchin, in a lengthy introduction, outlines the mystical poet's life and work, his orphan childhood and long residence in Banāras, his fame as author in various Indic tongues (the *Vinaya-patrikā* is composed in the dialect of Vraj, with individual variations). Cogent notes on metres and *Rāgas*, a useful series of notes on the text, and a full Glossary should contribute to Western appreciation of one of Asia's most inspired religious poets, a contemporary of Donne and Herbert, though his sweep is more epic.

The *Letter of Petition* sounds a single chord with variations that are psychologically and poetically most ingenious and sympathetic. Rām is the supreme object of worship and appeal ("You are master of the masterless, And who is more masterless than I?") though instinctive Hindu henotheism flows in invocations to other deities also (especially in the Prologue, where even the Ganges, Banāras, etc., receive lovely "praise"). The Hari-Śankarī Hymn divides each verse into Viṣṇu-worship and Śiva-worship.

Mr. Allchin writes excellently on the contrast between the *nirguṇa* and *saguṇa* attitudes (the Divine without, or with, attributes), and shows subtly how Tulsī Dās, though inclining to the former, in fact uses both and transcends their distinction. Devotion to the "Name" of Rām and the insistent imagery of "lotus-feet" and even "lotus-hands" surely indicate a further leaning on "attributes." Effective also are the many imagistic invocations of the parts of a Deity's body (not only female: cf. the male examples on pp. 117, 129, 130 etc.). Exquisite animal-similes abound, while Hymns 25-36 are in praise of Hanumān, the monkey assistant of Rām. Memorable is the image of the turtle and her eggs (pp. 154 and 273). The essence of Tulsī Dās lies in

his "ninefold path of devotion," described by the translator on pp. 65–70 of this truly welcome monument of scholarship and understanding.

TERENCE WHITE GERVAIS

Mirat-i-Ahmadi: A Persian History of Gujarat. By ALI MUHAMMAD KHAN. Translated by M. F. LOKHANDWALLA. (Gaekwad's Oriental Series, No. 146. Oriental Institute, Baroda. 946 pp. 1965. Rs. 45.00)

Persian sources for a history of India are many and varied. The *Mirat-i-Ahmadi* may be regarded as on par with Abul-Fazl's grand *Ain-i-Akbari.* It has two parts and an Appendix (*Khatima*). In Part I, the history of Gujarat up to 1714 is narrated; Part II covers the period 1715–61. All general information, topographical, biographical, and miscellaneous, is included in the Appendix. Previous translations of the *Mirat* have been partial. This one is complete.

Gujarat occupies in the Indian subcontinent a unique position of strategic as well as commercial importance, not to mention its religious and cultural claims. Pilgrims to Mecca had to pass through Gujarat, through Surat, in fact; and the Hindu sacred places of Somnath, Dwaraka and Riddhapur were all in Gujarat. At Surat and Cambay the British and other Europeans had established trading centres. For all these reasons, Gujarat was considered an important *subha* of the Mogul Empire. Marathas, in their own way, came to dominate at Baroda and Ahmedabad, the principality of the Gaekwads being finally established at Baroda.

The period which the *Mirat* covers was the heyday of Gujarat. Most of its feats of cultural assimilation — in art and architecture, in literature and religious thought — belong to this period. Many rulers and administrators, the interplay of currents introduced by them, the effort of the people to survive in spite of unfavourable trends, the intellectual and spiritual pursuits of the few — all these can be well studied with the help of this volume.

The translation is a monumental work and we only wish it had been executed with an eye to the reader for whom it is mainly meant. The result of an effort spread over many years has not been well presented, and few if any reading aids are provided. The Hijri Era dates are kept as in the original; the equivalent Gregorian dates are relegated to an Appendix. Long passages are not even broken into paragraphs for easy reading. Footnotes, which for a translation of this sort, from an old Persian original, are quite necessary for a proper understanding of the text, are lacking.

Worse still are the indexes, quite unbecoming to the large tome. That of Places (pp. 939–40) is obviously too scrappy. Curiously, the other is called an index of Names (meaning, personal names) and is much too short. Many important names are omitted. A new method of indexing seems to have been followed: instead of an alphabetical order, it follows an alphabetical *group,* which is quite annoying for a volume extending to over nine hundred closely printed pages.

Kuroh (*kos,* a distance of two to four miles?), *sanad* (a charter, a letter of authority?), *biwarah* (?), *Zat* (personal attendants?), *Sadr* (judge), *sarkar* (district, region?), and many similar words are used throughout as though they were English. They should have been italicized and a glossary of such words provided. In personal and place names, there are obvious variations, unavoidable perhaps since so many languages were involved, but they ought to have been corrected for proper identification. Jamnaji (p. 455) is in fact Chimanaji (the Peshwa's younger brother, 1703–40); Khanbhayat (p. 460) is used where Cambay was quite current.

The sense of chronology seems to be weak, although of historical narration it is the backbone. In Appendix I are listed the various Emperors and officers (pp. 929–33), but the dates of their

reigns or tenures do not appear.

A wonderful project has been ill presented. Book-production can no longer be neglected and all modern aids for greater utility and better attraction must be employed even in a serious book of this sort. The reviewer hopes to be excused by translator and publishers for insisting on this, and that future books in this learned series will be better produced.

S. R. TIKEKAR

Freedom — The Only End. By F. MCEACHRAN. (Johnson Publications, London. 126 pp. 1966. 21*s*.)

The preservation of human freedom at a time when mass society expands on every side and the institution of the State continually grows in power is a vital contemporary concern; it is the central theme of F. McEachran's book. The author interprets the many social and personal ills of our age as arising from the stifling of human freedom, the failure to recognize and act upon "natural laws," and the growth of "the monopolistic principle"; asserting that, if man were set free from the constraints of the power State, all would be well. The argument is sustained with reference to several fields: religion, morality, economics. The chapter on Original Sin (pp. 23–29) contains valuable points.

However, in arguing so vehemently for *laissez-faire* and a return to a Rousseau-esque State of Nature, the author is surely turning his back on the modern world which, with all its undeniable defects, yet is not wholly bad: as Teilhard de Chardin so rightly pointed out, "complexification" is making possible for the first time a world mind and a world consciousness. The urban civilization, mass production, and collectivism the author so fiercely denounces have produced a higher material, and in some ways cultural and even spiritual, civilization for more people than in most previous ages of man. Economic anarchy does not automatically operate according to "natural laws" (the author falsely equates "social laws" with physical laws) to produce abundance for all — all history shows it causes acute division of have and have-not classes and nations, and economic crises often leading to wars.

Modern life rather requires the State to become more personal, its planning more compassionate and intelligent, and its citizens more responsible towards each other.

B. G. COOPER

Your Child is a Person: A Psychological Approach to Parenthood without Guilt. By STELLA CHESS, ALEXANDER THOMAS, HERBERT G. BIRCH. (Peter Davies, London. ix+213 pp. 1966. 21*s*.)

Here is that rare thing, a reasonable, common-sense, based-on-experience book about young children. It is the result of a long-term research project, begun in 1956 with the support of a grant from the National Institute of Health (U.S.A.). The authors (all Professors of Psychiatry or Pediatrics) followed the psychological development of 231 children continuously from birth onward.

The main theme of the study is the variety of personality to be found in children: that children are all different, each one is unique although they may share tastes, habits, and problems as do all mankind. They show, as ever, a growing and changing life. "Physical growth and development . . . is a product of the interaction between constitutional factors *and* environment." The authors show, in great detail and with many fascinating case histories, how personality growth "lay in the interacting influence of the child's individuality, the parents' characteristics, and the broader social environment."

The many detailed chapters, dealing

with such matters as bed and sleep problems, "Breast or Bottle?" "A Code of Conduct," "Sex and Modesty," "Going to Nursery School," are not only helpful to the parent but to all who may have the care of children. The different examples given of behaviour will reassure many who have been using their own patience and common sense (often in defiance of certain psychologists!) and who know, by long experience, how to handle the everlastingly different children in this world and to help them grow happily.

The young teacher, or the young parent, who has had a very limited experience of children will find this a helpful and heartening book. It is objective and scientific in so far as it is based on long and careful observation, but although it makes certain basic suggestions that give a firm outline, yet it shows how very varied parental care may be, and still be *good*.

Finally the authors suggest that "Sometimes parents seem so weighed down with instructions and commandments that the joys of parenthood are quite obscured" . . . and then "Parents who enjoy their children in their own individual ways can be sure the children are also benefiting."

Needless to say this is a study of children in the United States of America, but the problems discussed are becoming common in England and also in other parts of the world. They are, it is true, problems of over-material civilizations, problems that occur with material wealth and spiritual poverty. The book has an excellent index, and it may be significant that it does not mention God or Religion. Otherwise it may be highly recommended!

ELIZABETH CROSS

South of the Zambesi: Poems from South Africa. By GUY BUTLER with an introduction by WILLIAM PLOMER and illustrations by JOHN LAWRENCE. (Abelard-Schuman, London. 32 pp. Illustrated. 1966.)

To say that Guy Butler is one of the most talented poets writing (in English) in South Africa today is not, perhaps, to say a great deal when one takes into account the fact that many of the best South African poets live in exile in England or elsewhere (i.e. William Plomer, R. N. Currey, F. T. Prince, Charles Madge, David Wright, Terence Heywood, Laurence Lerner, etc.). Even so, I cannot believe that *South of the Zambesi* will do much to enhance his reputation — and the poet himself seems to share this view when he insists that he regards "these anecdotal pieces as products of my left hand." In a brief introduction to this collection, William Plomer observes that Mr. Butler is "partisan only of imaginative truth" and that in all his work "there is not even a drop of racialist venom." This may well be so, but as most of these poems feature the "big black underdog" in one way or another, we might have expected to find, at least, some hint of the sense of conflict dominating South African society today. It is as though, in deliberately attempting to avoid any controversial statements, the poet has lost the tension which his earlier (and better) poems exhibited, and which is, of course, so essential to poetry at its best. These poems are interesting and mildly evocative, but will make little impact upon readers aware that so much remains unsaid. Perhaps it cannot be said in South Africa today?

HOWARD SERGEANT

Deities and Dolphins: The Story of the Nabataeans. By NELSON GLUECK. (Cassell, London. xii+650 pp. 220 Plates. Maps and Plans. 1966. 63*s*.)

This sumptuously produced and impressively learned book tells what recent

archaeological investigation has added to the scanty historical record of a once considerable culture. The Nabataeans, a Biblical people, mentioned also by the Greek historian, Diodorus Siculus, and the Greek geographer, Strabo, appear on the stage of history as a semi-nomadic people originating in the Arabian desert. Diodorus describes them as tent-dwellers who trafficked in the exotic products of Arabia, Africa, and India. They prospered. Not so much later Strabo describes them as settled agriculturalists living in stone houses. Agriculture, in fact, was one of their great achievements. Dr. Glueck's personal examination of hundreds of their sites disclosed the cisterns, reservoirs, and aqueducts which testify to their skill in soil-conservation and water-engineering. They exploited a territory which stretched from the north of Arabia to the south of Syria and spread across the peninsula of Sinai to the confines of Egypt. Over much of this region their villages, interconnected by busy roads, were thick upon the ground.

The flowering period of this Nabataean culture was the four centuries from 200 B.C. to A.D. 200. Its refinement is shown by the prevalence in this area of the broken remains of their wheel-turned kiln-baked ware, which is of astonishing fineness. Their political centre was at Petra, where their citadel was carved out of the rock. Their religious centre was the great temple of Khirbet Tannur, also built upon a mountain, which dominated its surroundings in lonely grandeur for some four hundred years. But the archaeological evidence does not consist only of temples, houses, water-works, and pottery. The Nabataeans, who spoke a form of the Aramaic which was the *lingua franca* of this area of intense civilization, were a highly-cultured people whose exploitation of the sea-routes of the Mediterranean led them in Hellenistic times to acquire Greek, to which, under Roman domination, they added also some acquaintance with Latin. The archaeological evidence accordingly includes also coins and papyri. This is a source of information which future discovery may enlarge.

As might be expected from their geographical setting, the religion of the Nabataeans was of the astral variety. The sun, moon, and planets and the circle of the zodiac figure in the sculptural adornments of their temples. But they paid particular devotion to Atargetis, or Aphrodite, as the symbol of fertility. She appears both as a grain-goddess and as a dolphin-goddess, the dolphin motif emphasizing the Mediterranean element in the culture of a people who had come to exploit the sea-routes of the Middle Sea as energetically as they had long exploited the caravan routes of Syria and Arabia.

In A.D. 106 the Nabataeans became part of the Roman province of Arabia, and then began to fade out of history a couple of hundred years later when they were absorbed into the civilization of Byzantium and Christianized. We may leave it to Dr. Glueck to pronounce their epitaph:

> The end of their existence as a separate people with an art and architecture and a place in the sun of their own was, from that moment on, inexorably determined, although not immediately consummated. Their system of society lacked the indestructible ideas of Greek philosophy, Roman law and Hebrew religion that bore within themselves the elements of cultural or physical perpetuity or both. The Nabataeans never succeeded in building a system of values and structure of faith whose enduring rightness could withstand the attrition of time and the indifference or antagonism of mortals.

B. FARRINGTON

The Magical Arts: A Short History. By C. A. BURLAND. (Arthur Barker Limited, London. 196 pp. Illustrated. 1966. 42*s*.)

We are informed on the cover page of this book that the author recently retired from the Department of Ethnography at the British Museum, and

that it is a short history of a complex development and is planned as groundwork from which the interested reader can advance to further detailed studies. Hence the book is for the general reader. The author makes no pretence of being an authority on the subject of magic, but he rightly points out in the introduction that the occult sciences have become separated from the life of civilized man, in spite of the fact that they are the brothers and sisters of the arts and sciences of today. The book covers the period from that of the Neanderthal man to the present age, and comments on a wide range of subjects including mythology, occultism, natural philosophy, alchemy, religion, and mysticism. At times, however, it is not quite clear to the reader where these subjects have a bearing on that of the magical arts. It may be that the author was unfortunate in the choice of the title of this book; for, although he displays a lot of practical common sense with regard to the subject under discussion, he is more lucid when dealing with the experiences of some of the greater mystics. On p. 133, for example, he refers to Maria Prophetissa as an eternal idea in the human mind, and on p. 140 to Boehme's realization that Evil was the concomitant of Good. Further, he notes that Boehme's visionary experiences displayed a close connection with Oriental ideas, although he had no direct contact with them.

EDWARD THORNTON

Rights of Self-Determination and Domicile. By MAHMUD BRELVI. (Muslim Intellectuals' International, Karachi, Pakistan. M.I.I. Series 1. 22 pp. 1966. Rs. 2.00)

This is a brief, but jejune, discussion of the principle of self-determination, a principle of great importance in the modern world. While the author has collected some good material, the treatment is too brief for a proper understanding of its basic meaning. On p. 1, the author maintains that the principle of self-determination, being included in the Charter of the United Nations, has the force of "positive law"; but on p. 12, he says: "There is no unanimity on the question of whether the Charter intended the right of self-determination to be understood as a formal rule of law or only as a principle." There is no discussion of this important point. For a vast and difficult subject, we cannot agree that this is a good beginning. The printing leaves much to be desired. Who is this "Sciller" on p. 2? Is it Schiller or some other scholar?

A. A. A. FYZEE

BALDOON DHINGRA

Leaves from a Paris Diary

[A special issue of the French review *Crapouillot* on the problem of LSD prompts Shri Baldoon Dhingra to put down his reflections. He says rightly that the urge towards these drugs expresses a strongly felt but ill-understood need to grow away from our egoistic selves and the world they have made — but drugs are no refuge. "Vigilance is the way to immortality."—ED.]

HUMAN BEINGS AND NATIONS resemble an orchestra. When each instrument tries to assert itself at the expense of the rest, the result is discord and confusion; if they voluntarily subordinate themselves to the whole, it is harmony; it is also the true democratic process. I have been led into these thoughts after reflecting a good deal on the nature of things in the world. We would probably

be willing to agree that what we need in an orchestra or in a society is not subordination on the basis of equal rights for every instrument or the suppression of this or that one, but that each instrument or each individual should make its proper noise or his proper contribution: the violin, say, is not to attempt to be a flute nor the 'cello imitate the harp, and so with people. Only the voluntary co-ordination of various sounds can produce a harmonious effect. And that is what all democracies want to achieve. Even as an orchestra looks for a conductor, so does democracy; but the conductor of democracy is the government, which must be able to think and act so as to produce the desired harmony — a symphony of diverse sounds — loud, soft, hard, screeching, even violent and threatening, but all melting into a mighty work of art.

One evolves into that state gradually; and the establishment of individual and mass freedom could, in point of time, take ages. We have to develop into that state. We are evolving from the "will to live" to the desire of the self for union with the not-self — the transformation of individualism into universalism, from the self to the "emptiness" which is a state of fullness. Thus people seek ecstasy, release which cannot be had with our idea of life; hence the close relation between that and the desire for a form of death. It is in this sense that one needs to treat the growing influence of drugs such as LSD. For some it is "the opening of the doors of perception," for others "power"; both these words spell "escape" from oneself, one's responsibilities. Many have created group-centres and Foundations: one is called I.F.I.F. (Informational Foundation of Inner Freedom, now changed to League for Spiritual Freedom).

A well-known French review, *Crapouillot,* has devoted a special issue to LSD, and articles by leading scientists like Jean Dolay of the Académie Française and authors like François Mauriac have appeared in its pages.

To Mauriac, whose article is entitled "*Les Jeunes et le LSD,*" this adventure is, for a man of faith, *pour un croyant, pour un homme de foi,* a sin; for Maritain these drugs are "*les sacrements du démon*": "The spirit of evil has in these days perfected the instrument of his reign." Mauriac will not have opened for him the Gates of Paradise at so cheap a price! The brilliant Prix Goncourt winner, Jean Can, puts it in this way: "I find it terrible that a man should surrender his will (I will not say his reason) and let himself slide into irresponsibility." Yes, there are adventures galore still for those who seek them: a trip to the Moon, a week-end in Mars, fine! But, beware of a flight into shoreless folly. Indeed, LSD has its apostles and its votaries. One of their leaders, or grand priests, Professor Timothy Leary, had a good deal to say to the question: How can this drug enrich human life?

> Thanks to LSD [Leary says], every human being will learn to understand that the complete history of evolution is registered in his body; every individual ought to remember and explore each avatar of his ancestral and majestic solitude. Each one will become his own Buddha, his own Einstein, his own Galileo. Instead of referring to bits of dead knowledge, pre-digested statistics which are transmitted to him by other symbol-makers, he will explore in his eighty years or so of mortal life on this planet to re-live all the possibilities of human, pre-human, and sub-human adventure. Having more time to spend on such worth-while explorations man will be less attached to foolish pastimes. And this might well be the natural solution to the problem of leisure. When hard work and intellectual labour shall have been taken over by machines what will we do? We shall busy ourselves by constructing even greater machines? The only reply to this particular dilemma is that man will explore numberless inner worlds, discover the terror, the adventures, and the ecstasies that reside deep within all of us.

Professor Dolay believes that we are only at the threshold of the "age of the tranquillizer," but he holds the possibilities to be immense. He also

thinks that these discoveries entail, as all discoveries do, great dangers, even though their usefulness to psychotherapists and psychiatrists could be invaluable. To Alain Pelgrand, LSD is the beginning of a great adventure for the human race; for man will one day know how the brain functions — "a great adventure, perhaps the most dangerous of all."

All life is an adventure, but the greatest adventure has always been that in which a man loses his life through self-conquest, by dying to his little ego. Thus, in a sense, we long for death; we fear it only in our individual selves. The votaries of LSD seek the same thing, but by an easy way out. They want to love desperately, to give themselves, but find they cannot. They want to find happiness in the conquest of the world they live in; they want to conquer their individualities, which is a form of death. For love is nothing but the same conquest; through it man ceases to be absorbed in himself; the happiness of the loved one is preferred to one's own; one's little ego is surrendered to an idea, whatever it be — be it the race, the nation, or a work of art. Only then does a man feel happy.

Now LSD or another drug could give ecstasy or temporary death, cessation from self-consciousness; for here individuality is overcome, the self fused into the not-self; which is death creating new life. We all want a partial fulfilment of our desires, a sort of love-death. Only a saint, an *Arhat*, or a *Jivan-mukta* attains deathlessness. The search for drugs and their use is only an attempted short-cut to an undiscovered world, but it is fraught with the highest dangers. There are no short-cuts. What LSD-takers seek is Nirvāṇa, an emptiness of self-hood. But Nirvāṇa, as Tagore once said, is not a lamp that goes out in the darkness but a lamp which blends with the rising sun and disappears in it.

The drug addicts must be wary and circumspect. For drug-taking can be the worst form of *tamas*: it is a sign of not growing up, of wanting to remain *childish*. On the other hand, the great spirits teach that man is to overcome the self; to fly from the self is a dereliction of duty. All thinking and writing about "mind," "ecstasy," "freedom" are worthless unless a man starts by realizing that the path which leads to the summit and that which leads to the bottomless pit are alike and yet at the same time diametrically opposite.

BALDOON DHINGRA

Ends and Sayings

"... ends of verse
And sayings of philosophers."

—SAMUEL BUTLER: *Hudibras*

In a BBC television conversation with Oliver Hunkin on "Doubts and Certainties" (*The Listener*, 27 October 1966) Dr. Erich Fromm, the distinguished psychologist, gives his reasons for having questioned the usual values put on obedience and disobedience (virtue and vice). The terms are relative to their situation. The person who is unable to disobey is also unable to resist demands that are against his own conscience, against even the religious and philosophical principles officially supported by those making the demands. He equates the "disobedience" of Adam and Eve with that of Prometheus in the Greek myth. (In the Indian *Mahābhārata* the Pāṇḍavas also fight against such respected figures as Bhīṣma and Droṇa, who symbolize the

accepted customs, the established moral law and order.) It takes courage, says Dr. Fromm, to stand up to authority and say "no" because one's own conscience demands another allegiance. Too often the voice of our conscience is drowned by the voice of society proclaiming its "good" and "evil." Nevertheless, he declares, it shows in dreams, in our fear-reactions, and in the struggle of even mass criminals to keep a fragment of humane feeling alive — towards their family, children, animals, etc. We have both good and evil in us, and only by accepting both can we experience our common humanity with all.

Other thought-provoking points were the rejection of the Freudian sexual interpretation of the tie between mother and child. The tie is one of protection, of dependence, of security; and for adults, the State, Church, God, or Society may take the place of the mother. Maturity comes only with real independence — self-responsibility and judgement — the most difficult thing to attain. Paradoxically, in love and comradeship, there is, simultaneously, individual independence and the bridge that unites.

Sex is not love.

> In fact today, what one calls our sexual emancipation is, I think, part of our whole consumer culture. Sex has become an article of consumption, like cigarettes, like liquor, like movies ... .

He defines true love as "knowledge of the other person . . . the kind of knowledge when I experience in myself what goes on in the other person." It implies care, concern, and responsibility (i.e., a response as distinct from a duty). He sees that man has lost the instinctive natural urge of the animal, and now has to learn his own life. This means unfolding the human qualities, "the human powers of love, of understanding, of courage, of fortitude, of generosity."

On Mr. Hunkin saying that Dr. Fromm's scientific terms could equally be put in religious ones, the latter agreed, emphasizing that different ways always had to be found to express the fundamental concepts necessary for religious experience. What people believe or think is secondary. What matters is how they are concerned for others, how they act. Dr. Fromm is always stimulating, and speaks truly as regards people's surface ideas. They are secondary, and people's concerns and actions disclose their *real* beliefs. "As a man thinks, so he becomes." Paradoxically, one could quote with equal justice:

> Make clean and clear, first, the mental conceptions and perceptions; and the rest *will follow naturally* (ROBERT CROSBIE: *The Friendly Philosopher,* p. 8).

Publicity about the blind irrational revolt, chiefly of the young, against the blind acceptance of life and of the established order, has been much highlighted. Yet it is only the swing of the pendulum. What is more significant is the intelligent questioning of fundamental principles by a minority of thinkers. Thus Mary Stott, on the "Woman's Page" (*The Guardian,* 15 November 1966) asks "WHY pain?" Recognizing that pain is "an essential part of the natural order" and also affords valuable warning, she rejects the crazy notion (on which so much time and money has been spent) that medicine can somehow abolish pain for mankind.

Primitive folk blame pain on evil spirits, enemies, or disobedience to a vengeful god. Christians saw it as punishment for sin, or as a means to purchase salvation. Humane rationalists today cannot swallow the idea of the sins of the fathers being visited on innocent children, just as some people cannot face the Christian idea of One suffering on the Cross in atonement for the many. Mary Stott notes the change of attitude and feeling since the eighteenth century, and growth of public conscience as regards pain, to which Marghanita Laski has drawn attention in a recent book. She asks finally:

Has pain a meaning, a purpose, in the universe? Can it be *used*? Is there any line of research to be followed in the experience of some mothers who, following natural childbirth methods, *use* the birthpangs and are even exhilarated by them? Is there any theologian, philosopher or scientist who can suggest an answer to my question? WHY pain?

Yet, is it not possible that the answer lies in the twin doctrines of Karma and Reincarnation (the "lost chord" of Christianity)? Pain could then be the outcome of wrong action (and action includes thought and feeling energies) carried over from previous lives whose circumstances did not permit an immediate adjustment of the wrong done. By suffering we pay our debts. But pain can also be *used,* as a voluntary discipline, an exercise for developing strength and compassion, qualities totally alien to the painless cotton-wool existence. In Mary Stott's example of the birthpangs, the mother rises above the opposites of pain and pleasure to the larger joy of fulfilment. Nevertheless the alleviation of pain *by natural means* is still desirable as an aid, whether to adjustment, or to growth. One questions, however, whether some of the suppressive techniques, by drugs or psychological, may not drive the evil inwards, so that it erupts again later, or, in the other case, may not hamper true growth.

Despite advances in medical science, the uncertain and controversial nature of many of the propositions put forward can be gauged by the contradictions in the theories advanced, as well as by the "second-thoughts" that come up after a period of trial on "guinea-pigs." At an international symposium on oral contraceptives, one gynaecologist claimed the pill could stop early cancer of the womb. On the other hand Dr. Victor Wynn, reader in human metabolism, St. Mary's Hospital, London, gave warning (*The Observer,* 30 October 1966) of blood changes in women taking the pill — increased sugars and fats made the blood more male in type. Men are more prone to hardening of the arteries and coronary and heart disease. Women taking the pill, therefore, may share the same hazards. The theory that cancer of the cervix can be prevented by early detection through taking cervical smears has led to agitation for greater facilities for this screening. Now this belief is challenged by more than one medical man (*The Observer,* 6 and 13 November 1966), since there may be two kinds of cervical cancer, and a negative test for one gives no reassurance about the other. A few days later (*The Guardian,* 17 November 1966) a report throws doubt on the value of radiation treatment for cancer in the chest. According to Dr. Keith Cohn, of the Stanford University Medical School, radiation therapy apparently cured chest cancer, but 3.4 to 5.8 per cent of the cases developed heart disease. Of 21 such patients, 6 died from the heart complications.

Medical practices are only too often empiric, a juggling of symptoms and effects, which upset still further the complex living balance of the organism. Contraceptive drugs, with their far-from-understood hormones, are simply another suppressive technique, a betrayal of natural law. What kind of repercussions will bring nemesis on the unfortunates involved with them? Preventive medicine should be, not the prevention of symptoms, but the long-term education in right living, to prevent the causes of disease. Publicity about the correlation between smoking and lung cancer has produced a substantial increase of non-smokers among young people. This will reduce, naturally, the lung cancer deaths which now number 72 a day in Britain.

INDEX TO VOL. XXXVII

The Index to Vol. XXXVII (January-December 1966) will be issued with THE ARYAN PATH for February 1967.